

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

BEFORE THE  
  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
  
- - - - - x  
IN THE MATTER OF: : Project Number  
BROADWATER ENERGY LNG PROJECT : PF05-4-000  
- - - - - x  
  
East Lyme High School  
30 Chesterfield Road  
East Lyme, CT  
  
Tuesday, September 20, 2005  
  
The above-entitled matter came on for scoping  
meeting, pursuant to notice at 7:10 p.m.  
  
MODERATOR: JIM MARTIN, FERC

1 APPEARANCES:

2 Peter Boynton,

3 Coast Guard Captain, Port for Long Island Sound

4

5 Richard Blumenthal,

6 Attorney General of the State of Connecticut

7

8 Ed Jutila,

9 State representative, 37th district

10

11 Andrea Stillman,

12 State senator for the 20th District

13

14 Betsy Ritter,

15 State representative of 38th District

16

17 Louise

18 Peoplewitz (phonetic)

19

20 Edward Purcell

21

22 Bill McCue

23

24 -- continued --

25

1        APPEARANCES CONTINUED:  
2  
3                John Andrews  
4                Josephine Collymore  
5  
6                Jack Dooley  
7  
8                Norris McDonald  
9  
10               Seb Morton  
11  
12               Mike Lesley  
13  
14               Molly McKay  
15  
16               Ray Collins  
17  
18               Doug VanNewman  
19  
20               John Egan  
21  
22               Bruce Whichard  
23  
24               John Case

1        APPEARANCES CONTINUED:  
2                    Kiki Kennedy  
3  
4                    Baeda Napolitino  
5  
6                    Pauline Lord  
7  
8                    Michael Greave  
9  
10                  Peter Dixon  
11  
12                  Ed Root  
13                  Bonnie Reemsnyder,  
14  
15                  Sheryl Larder  
16  
17                  James Reinhart  
18  
19                  John W. Bill Sheehan  
20  
21                  Bob Gatwas  
22  
23                  Chris Anglon  
24  
25                  Lucy Sober

1        APPEARANCES CONTINUED:  
2  
3                Sinsi Lin  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (7:10 a.m.)

3 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much for coming  
4 tonight. My name is Jim Martin; I'm the environmental  
5 project manager for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
6 or FERC. Seated with me here tonight is the United States  
7 Coast Guard Captain of the Port for Long Island Sound, Capt.  
8 Peter Boynton. He's joined here tonight by Lt. Cmdr. Allen  
9 Blume, (phonetic) and Lt. Andrea Logman, (phonetic). Also  
10 present from FERC is my deputy project manager, Joanne  
11 Wachholder.

12 Our environmental contractor ENTRIX is  
13 represented by Bill Staeger who is seated next to me. Wayne  
14 Kicklighter and Amy Parsons (phonetic) are at the table in  
15 the back assisting Joanne. We're here tonight to provide  
16 some information and to hear your comments on the Broadwater  
17 Energy LNG project. I'd like to take a moment to briefly  
18 describe the project. Broadwater is proposing to build and  
19 operate a liquefied natural gas terminal near the center of  
20 Long Island Sound.

21 LNG is natural gas with methane that is being  
22 cooled to an extremely cool temperature of -260 degrees  
23 Fahrenheit. The gas is not stored under pressure and is not  
24 explosive in its liquid state. The terminal would be  
25 permanently moored approximately nine miles offshore from

1 Long Island and 10 miles offshore from Connecticut. The  
2 terminal would consist of a Floating Storage and  
3 Regasification Unit or FSRU that would be approximately 1200  
4 feet in length, 200 feet in width and rising approximately  
5 80 feet above the waterline.

6 The FSRU would be designed to accommodate a net  
7 storage capacity of approximately 350,000 cubic meters of  
8 LNG or the equivalent of eight billion cubic feet of natural  
9 gas. The LNG would be delivered to the FSRU in LNG carriers  
10 at the frequency of two to three carriers per week. The  
11 FSRU would have a closed-loop vaporization system to  
12 vaporize or regasify the LNG at a typical rate of about one  
13 billion cubic feet per day. The gas would be directed into  
14 a send-out pipeline that would extend approximately 22 miles  
15 to an offshore connection with existing Iroquois pipeline,  
16 which provides natural gas to New York and Connecticut  
17 markets.

18 Tonight's meeting is a joint meeting hosted by  
19 FERC and the U.S. Coast Guard. We have slightly different  
20 review processes that this meeting will support, but  
21 fundamentally the whole purpose of tonight's meeting is to  
22 provide each of you with an opportunity to give us your  
23 comments to tell us what the environmental safety and  
24 security issues are that you think we should address in our  
25 respective analyses of the Broadwater Project. I will

1       briefly describe the FERC process, and then Capt. Boynton  
2       will describe the Coast Guard process.

3               The FERC staff's environmental and engineering  
4       analysis will result in the generation of an environmentally  
5       packed statement for EIS. FERC is the lead federal agency  
6       tasked with preparing the EIS. We are fortunate to have  
7       several cooperating agencies that will help us ensure that  
8       all concerns are represented. The cooperating agencies  
9       include U.S. Army corps of engineers, the Environmental  
10      Protection Agency, the National Marine Fishery Service, U.S.  
11      Department of Transportation, the New York State Department  
12      of State, and our partner agency; the Coast Guard.

13              I'd like to take a few moments now to further  
14      explain the purpose of tonight's public meeting. First, I'd  
15      like to clarify that the Broadwater proposal was not  
16      conceived by and was not promoted by either FERC or the  
17      Coast Guard. FERC reviews applications for the import of  
18      natural gas and Broadwater is in the process of preparing  
19      application to submit to FERC.

20              Once the application is submitted, our obligation  
21      is to review that application and prepare an analysis of the  
22      environmental impacts. Tonight's meeting is not a public  
23      hearing, we're not here to debate the proposal or to make  
24      any determinations on its fate. We're here to listen to  
25      your concerns so that we can consider them in our analysis.

1       Based on the letters we've received, we understand that many  
2       people are opposed to the concept of having an offshore  
3       natural gas import facility.

4               Others raise concerns about the environmental  
5       impacts or safety considerations. That is some objections  
6       are general in nature, and some objections are based on  
7       potential environmental and safety impacts. Both categories  
8       are important to FERC, but they're addressed in different  
9       ways. General objections to the project would be considered  
10      during the Commission's public interest review, whereas  
11      environmental and safety impacts are addressed by the FERC  
12      staff in our environmental impact statement.

13              And the EIS is an analysis of impacts to  
14      resources and does not analyze public opinion. With that  
15      said, we request that your comments tonight focus on  
16      potential effects of the project specifically. We're here  
17      to ask for your help in identifying potential impacts to  
18      both the human and natural environment of Long Island Sound.  
19      In our Notice of Intent, issued on August 11, we requested  
20      your comments and assigned a deadline of October 7.

21              We will take comments throughout our review of  
22      the project, but for us to adequately address your comments,  
23      analyze them and research the issues, we ask that you try to  
24      get those to us as soon as possible. The speakers' list is  
25      located at the back table and we will use that to identify

1 individuals wishing to provide verbal comments on the  
2 Broadwater project. In addition to verbal comments provided  
3 tonight, we'll also accept your written comments.

4 Many people have already submitted the comments  
5 to the FERC docket. If you have comments, but don't wish to  
6 speak tonight, you may provide written comments on comment  
7 forms at the table in the front there. You may drop those  
8 off with us or mail them at a later date, be sure to include  
9 our project docket number, which is PF05-4.

10 The Broadwater project is currently in our pre-  
11 filing process, that is an application has not yet been  
12 filed with FERC, we consider the pre-filing process to be  
13 amongst other things an extension of our scoping process.  
14 The scoping process is a learning process. It is where we  
15 educate ourselves about the project and the central issues.  
16 During the scoping process, we are gathering information and  
17 we are using a number of different sources for that  
18 information.

19 Could I ask that you please turn off your cell  
20 phones if you have one, thank you.

21 The four general sources that we're using right  
22 now are information provided by the applicant, input from  
23 other agencies, our own fieldwork and research of different  
24 issues, and information from the public. Once we gather the  
25 information during the scoping process, we'll analyze it and

1 we'll prepare a draft Environmental Impact Statement, or  
2 draft EIS, that will be distributed for comments.

3 There are two general ways that you can get a  
4 copy of the draft EIS. First of all, the notice of intent  
5 that we sent out has an attachment on the back of it; you  
6 can fill out and mail it to FERC. Secondly, you could fill  
7 in the mailing list form on the table when you -- where you  
8 came in, provide your address, and name, and we will add you  
9 to the mailing list.

10 If you don't do one of those two things, we won't  
11 be able to provide a copy. After the draft EIS is issued,  
12 there's a 45-day comment period. During that period, we'll  
13 normally hold another public meeting, similar in format to  
14 this one. We'll probably come back here to the same  
15 facility if it is available, and ask you to comment on the  
16 information provided in the draft Environmental Impact  
17 Statement.

18 At the end of the 45-day comment period, we begin  
19 synthesizing all the information gathered today in preparing  
20 the final EIS. Once we have issued the final EIS, it is  
21 forwarded to our commissioners. Our commissioners at the  
22 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission would use that document  
23 as well as other information to make a determination on  
24 whether or not to grant an authorization for this project.  
25 At this time Capt. Boynton will describe the work being

1 performed by the Coast Guard; following the Coast Guard  
2 presentation we'll begin listening to your comments. Capt.  
3 Boynton.

4 MR. BOYNTON: Thank you, my name is Peter  
5 Boynton, I'm the Coast Guard Captain of the Port for Long  
6 Island Sound. I'm responsible for Coast Guard operations in  
7 Connecticut, on Long Island Sound, and along the north and  
8 south shores of Long Island. I'd like to describe the Coast  
9 Guard role with regard to the Broadwater LNG proposal.

10 The Coast Guard is a cooperating agency with  
11 FERC; the Coast Guard is neither supporting nor opposing the  
12 project. Our role is to assess safety and security for this  
13 proposal. The process that we use in assessing safety and  
14 security is one that I think is best described as managing  
15 risk. We do not eliminate risk, we manage risk. And the  
16 way we do that when we do an assessment of both safety and  
17 security is to break risk down into its component pieces.

18 The pieces that the Coast Guard uses to assess  
19 risk are threat, vulnerability and consequence. And we look  
20 at each of those elements of risk in order to asses what the  
21 risk is, identify any gaps, and attempt to find various ways  
22 to mitigate any gaps. We have pursued a number of methods  
23 to get public input; one of those is that we have been  
24 attending various open houses since the project was  
25 announced in November, both here in Connecticut and on Long

1 Island.

2 We're co-hosting these meetings with FERC; two on  
3 Long Island and two in Connecticut, and we've established  
4 the docket for written comments. I have been receiving  
5 letters from residents both on Long Island and here in  
6 Connecticut for -- about the last month, on Sundays up to a  
7 160 letters per day. To date, I have read all of those  
8 letters and am in the process of replying to all of them and  
9 I'll attempt to continue to reply as long as we can do that.

10 I'd like to talk a little bit about the first of  
11 our two assessments; the safety assessment and the process  
12 we're using to do that. We began our safety assessment with  
13 a two-day workshop last May, held in Port Jefferson. The  
14 workshop is what we refer to as a Ports and Waterways Safety  
15 Assessment. We refer to it by its acronym PAWSA. The Coast  
16 Guard has done about three-dozen of these safety assessments  
17 over the last five or six years. Assessing waterway safety  
18 at various locations all around the country, not necessarily  
19 related to LNG projects.

20 Since we've done this several dozen times, we've  
21 developed a pretty rigorous process to look at waterway  
22 safety on any particular body of water. The way we do this  
23 is invite a group of waterway users or stakeholders. We  
24 have a group of 30 people.

25 In the case of the assessment we did here, we had

1       representatives from environmental groups from both sides of  
2       the Sound, representatives of recreational boating users,  
3       representatives of commercial fishermen, representatives  
4       from the commercial vessel industry, pilots, tugboat  
5       captains; representatives from various government agencies,  
6       both from Long Island and from Connecticut, And then we  
7       look at elements of waterway safety on the Sound.

8               Now, this process was just a starting point for  
9       our safety assessment; it's not the final report, it's a  
10      baseline assessment of safety on Long Island Sound. It  
11      looked at things like density of marine traffic, different  
12      types of use of the Sound, commercial, recreational. It  
13      looked at marine firefighting capabilities on the Sound.  
14      And some of the things that the assessment found for example  
15      was that we do not have a very good marine firefighting  
16      capability on Long Island Sound other than small vessels.

17             We typically get that from the port of New York  
18      and New Jersey. So we would view that as a gap in safety.  
19      Waterways safety assessment also looked at the current use  
20      of the Sound, and found that although the numbers vary from  
21      year to year, Long Island Sound receives about 700 foreign  
22      commercial vessels per year coming to the Sound to deliver  
23      various types of cargo from ports all around the world;  
24      Indonesia, Columbia, Algeria, delivering oil, and other  
25      types of cargo. So that's about 700 foreign ships a year.

1           The assessment also found that we receive about  
2       1200 commercial domestic arrivals per year in the Sound.  
3       And many of these are barges carrying oil, often coming from  
4       the port of New York and New Jersey to ports either on Long  
5       Island or in Connecticut. So the total number of commercial  
6       vessel arrivals is about 1900 per year making port calls to  
7       deliver cargo. And the assessment found that in addition to  
8       that, and again these numbers vary from year to year as  
9       well, but roughly 2000 to 4000 commercial vessels making use  
10      of the Sound as a sort of an I-95 of the water, where  
11      commercial vessels, many of them, tugboats and barges are  
12      transiting from one end of the Sound to the other, they  
13      don't stop here, they're just using the Sound as a waterway,  
14      often to and from the port of New York, New Jersey.

15           So added together that's roughly 4000 to 6000  
16      commercial vessels using the sound per year at this point in  
17      time. Our next step with the waterways safety assessment --  
18      and I should know that the result of that two-day workshop  
19      has been posted on the Coast Guard website. I think we have  
20      a handout at the door that lists the website where you can  
21      obtain that assessment, and I would caution you this is not  
22      the final Coast Guard safety assessment for the Broadwater  
23      proposal; this is a general assessment of waterways safety  
24      in Long Island Sound that we're using as a baseline.

25           We'll convene our harbor safety committee to look

1 at that baseline and use that as a starting point to then  
2 assess specifics of safety as they relate to the Broadwater  
3 proposal, again looking at the elements of risk, threats to  
4 safety, vulnerabilities and consequences, where are their  
5 gaps, and what might various mitigations be.

6 I'd like to talk for a minute about our second  
7 area of assessment, and that's for port security. Unlike  
8 the safety assessment, the port security assessment is done  
9 at a level referred to as "Sensitive Security Information;  
10 SSI." And that means that it's not releasable to the  
11 public; it's a level of information protection that we give  
12 to protect information regarding security of the ports.

13 Again, we do the security assessment by looking  
14 at the elements of risk, threat, vulnerability and  
15 consequence. Instead of a working group like we did with  
16 the PAWSA, we're using a subcommittee from a group called  
17 the "Aria Maritime Security Committee." There are about 40  
18 Coast Guard captains of the port around the country like me,  
19 and under the Maritime Transportation Security Act each one  
20 of those captains of the port is charged with chairing a  
21 maritime security committee.

22 The committee that I chair here in Long Island  
23 Sound includes local, state and federal representatives and  
24 representatives of industry from both sides of the Sound.  
25 And the purpose of that group is to meet and assess and

1 develop security practices for ports in Long Island Sound.  
2 We've created a subcommittee of that group whose purpose is  
3 to assist us doing the security assessment for the  
4 Broadwater proposal.

5 And in a manner similar to the safety assessment,  
6 our concern is that we don't want to do these assessments  
7 whether for safety or security based solely on the Coast  
8 Guard perspective. We want to pull in as many stakeholders  
9 as we can to assist us with the assessment to give us a  
10 broader view. In the case of the security assessment, those  
11 stakeholders are all security related stakeholders; so  
12 representatives of the state police from both sides, FBI,  
13 our emergency management, police, fire, et cetera.

14 We have not yet completed the security assessment  
15 nor the safety assessment, and part of the reason for that  
16 is right now we're operating off the pre-filing application  
17 that we received from Broadwater in November. We can't  
18 finish these assessments until we have the full application  
19 from Broadwater, the formal application, which has not yet  
20 occurred. Once we have that formal application with all of  
21 the information that we need, we'll then complete both the  
22 safety and security assessments, we will provide those in a  
23 report to FERC for FERC to include in the draft  
24 Environmental Impact Statement.

25 The last thing I'd like to talk about --

1 something that comes up in a lot of the letters I've  
2 received and also comes up a lot at the various open houses  
3 that we've been attending since last winter, and that is  
4 security or safety zone that might be put around either the  
5 tankers moving through the Sound or the fixed facility  
6 moored in the Sound. It is typical at the 4, now 5 LNG  
7 facilities operating around the country to have security and  
8 safety zones.

9           Each of those zones are a little bit different;  
10 they vary depending on the specific circumstances of the  
11 facility, and the location where the facility is. In the  
12 example of Boston, which I give only as an example, not  
13 because it's similar to a potential facility in Long Island  
14 Sound, but in that case, one of the zones around the tankers  
15 is a moving zone. So as the tanker moves, the zone moves  
16 around the tanker like a bubble; that zone is roughly two  
17 miles ahead of the tanker, one mile to the stern of the  
18 tanker, and a half or a mile on either side.

19           I give this just as an example to try to give  
20 some context to how these security zones typically operate.  
21 On a tanker that would be proceeding at a normal speed of  
22 say, 12 knots, it would take a zone of that size, which is a  
23 fairly large zone, 15 minutes to pass. During those 15  
24 minutes no vessels are allowed to enter the zone without the  
25 express permission of the Captain of the Port. What that

1 means is that in some locations those zones are tailored for  
2 traffic in that area.

3 In the case of Boston some ferries are allowed to  
4 transit that zone during the movement of the tanker  
5 depending on the circumstances. It's a measure taken to  
6 provide both safety and security around the tanker as it  
7 moves. In the case of a potential fixed facility in the  
8 Sound, which Broadwater has proposed, there would likely be  
9 a similar safety and security zone; only in the case of the  
10 fixed facility, it would not move like with a tanker but  
11 would be a bubble around that facility, again for the  
12 purpose of both safety and security.

13 In many of the letters and the comments that I've  
14 heard at the open houses, there's been a lot of talk about -  
15 - the zone will be, and then there's a distance cited. I  
16 can't tell you how big either zone will be, because they  
17 will depend on the results of the safety and security  
18 assessments. And until we have those assessments, there's  
19 no good basis to determine how large the zones should be.  
20 So just to sum up, we'll complete the safety and security  
21 assessments, once we have the formal application, we'll  
22 provide those results to FERC to be included in the draft  
23 Environmental Impact Statement and we'll continue to involve  
24 as broad a group of stakeholders as we can, thank you.

25 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Capt. Boynton.

1 Now, we begin taking your comments. As your name is read, I  
2 would like you to come to the podium and state your name for  
3 the record. All of your comments would be transcribed and  
4 put into the public record for the project. Public record  
5 is available on our website at [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov); in that page,  
6 select eLibrary link and input the docket number PF05-4.  
7 You can use eLibrary to access everything that the  
8 commission does with this project as well as all the filings  
9 and information submitted by Broadwater and comments from  
10 the public.

11 In your comments tonight, I ask that you try to  
12 be as specific as possible with your environmental or safety  
13 and security concerns. As stated in our notice, the meeting  
14 is scheduled to conclude at 10:00 p.m. We have a little  
15 less than three hours now and approximately -- at this  
16 point, approximately 20-22 speakers. So I'm going to ask  
17 that you try to keep it to roughly five minutes or so. That  
18 way we'll have enough time to make sure that everyone has an  
19 opportunity to speak.

20 If you have written comments you may submit them  
21 directly to the transcript rather than read them aloud. And  
22 if your comments have been previously stated by another  
23 speaker, you may also just endorse the comments from the  
24 previous speaker rather than repeat them if that's what you  
25 would like to do. If we have additional time at the end,

1 we'll call from the audience for additional speakers. So we  
2 -- I anticipate that we will, so if you didn't sign up, you  
3 can probably still have an opportunity to speak after we go  
4 through our list. Thank you very much for your  
5 consideration and now we're going to do a mike check and  
6 then start calling names.

7 First action of the night. As is our practice we  
8 will invite elected officials up first in the list, and  
9 without being too rude so that everybody has time, I'll give  
10 you a brief reminder of when you have about a minute left  
11 with our expensively prepared sign, I assure you, there have  
12 been no tax dollars spent on this sign. Our first speaker  
13 will be Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General of the State of  
14 Connecticut.

15 MR. BLUMENTHAL: Thank you, thank you very much  
16 for this opportunity to be with you, and thank you to both  
17 FERC and the Coast Guard for making yourselves available  
18 from -- probably some long distances in the case of Mr.  
19 Martin, and shorter but still substantial distances in the  
20 case of Capt. Boynton and other members of the Coast Guard  
21 who're here. Tonight you can show that one-minute sign any  
22 time during my remarks, and I apologize I'm not going to be  
23 able to endorse the remarks of the previous speaker. I want  
24 to say that we are at an early stage in this process.

25 I recognize that fact, but we're also at a

1 crucial turning point in the history of Long Island Sound, a  
2 shared, precious, irreplaceable national treasure. We're at  
3 a turning point and a possible precipice in considering a  
4 project that I regard to have intolerable risk, both in  
5 terms of environment, safety as well as security.

6 And I say that on the basis of very substantial  
7 research and study including the excellent study that the  
8 Coast Guard has done, the Coast Guard ports and waterways  
9 safety assessment that was mentioned earlier that shows the  
10 very substantial congestion on the Sound that already  
11 exists, and demonstrates the increased risk of injury and  
12 possible accidents as a result of the tankers, not to  
13 mention the facility itself that exists. And I know that  
14 the report itself shows that the Sound is a stressed and  
15 fragile echo system that it is already at risk  
16 environmentally from projects that had been proposed and  
17 built before, as well as from the very substantial use made  
18 of it not only commercially but recreationally, and the  
19 natural forces that are combining to put it at risk,  
20 historically. These trends environmentally have been  
21 predicted and additional dangers can be predicted with some  
22 scientific accuracy. What can't be known at this point is  
23 what emergencies and disasters may befall us if we've learnt  
24 nothing else from hurricane Katrina. Let us take the lesson  
25 that the unexpected and unthinkable can happen.

1                   In the case of this facility there would be  
2                   unimaginable and unimagined disaster and destruction even if  
3                   we had only the only kind of hurricanes that we've had in  
4                   1938 and 1944, even if we had only the kinds of natural  
5                   unpredictable disasters that are known to occur in this part  
6                   of the world as well as during the hurricane season in the  
7                   south.

8                   And so I think we should learn that lesson very,  
9                   very importantly in managing this. But also deciding that  
10                  these risks posed by this project are simply unacceptable  
11                  and intolerable. And there are better ways to achieve the  
12                  same objectives. We have a responsibility as stewards of  
13                  the Sound to preserve it.

14                 The state is the owner of the bottom of the  
15                 Sound, and we have a stewardship responsibility to preserve  
16                 that vital and vulnerable area already threatened as an  
17                 ecosystem and as a source of wildlife and nourishment, but  
18                 we have a responsibility as well to anticipate dangers that  
19                 may occur in the future, and to plan and build alternatives  
20                 to meet our energy needs. There are better, safer  
21                 alternatives.

22                 And we need to plan regionally to deliver natural  
23                 gas where it is needed, without the intolerable, and  
24                 unacceptable risk that are posed by this project. I have  
25                 submitted -- or I -- rather I will submit written testimony

1       that describes in greater detail my fact-based fears about  
2       explosions, collisions, other kinds of, at this point  
3       unknowable, but somewhat predictable disasters that may  
4       occur.

5               I believe that the written testimony will provide  
6       further factual support, but I also hope in the future to be  
7       part of this process, to continue to be part of the process.  
8       And I want to thank you, each of you and each of your  
9       agencies for the stewardship that I know you will devote to  
10      caring and exercising the kind of responsibility that -- in  
11      caring for the Sound as well as for our energy needs so  
12      vitally demands. Thank you very much.

13              MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you for your comments.  
14      Next speaker will be Ed Jutila, state representative, 37th  
15      district.

16              MR. JUTILA: Thank you. First, as the  
17      representative, state representative from the 37th district,  
18      which includes the town of East Lyme, where we are tonight,  
19      I'd like to welcome you gentlemen to our town, and welcome  
20      everyone else here who's come out tonight for this important  
21      hearing. And I think what I would like to do is take your  
22      cue and primarily associate myself with the most eloquent  
23      remarks that the Attorney General just made.

24              I'll add just a few brief things and then move on  
25      and let the remaining speakers come up and probably testify

1 with much greater detail and expertise than I can on the  
2 specific issues. I have a strong sense of opposition to  
3 this project, period, exclamation point. And I know you  
4 talked about the job you have ahead of you in doing your  
5 assessments, but I just can't imagine what you're going to  
6 come up with through those assessments that's going to make  
7 people like me who have lived here, grown up on the  
8 shoreline, in the shoreline town on Long Island Sound.

9 I just can't imagine what you're going to do to  
10 make me feel comfortable or good about this project. And  
11 just to summarize what I think you're going to hear a lot of  
12 tonight and in the future, this project clearly would  
13 harmfully industrialize Long Island Sound, a great natural  
14 resource of ours which we've done so much in the past few  
15 years to improve the quality of the Sound, and this would  
16 just be a huge and monumental step backwards. There's a  
17 vulnerability to catastrophic accidents or worse through  
18 sabotage, terrorism.

19 It's just too big a temptation sitting out there  
20 for potential terrorists, not to mention that it would  
21 simply spoil the view. I mean, I just don't think the  
22 people who live on the shoreline here can even fathom the  
23 possibility of looking out there and seeing a 10-storied  
24 structure instead of being able to look across on a nice  
25 clear day and see Long Island Sound like we're all so used

1 to.

2 I've heard it said that the building would be  
3 designed and constructed to withstand a 150-mile an hour  
4 winds. Well, again, I'm not an expert in meteorology or  
5 construction, but I know that -- I'm told that category 4  
6 goes up to a 150 miles an hour and there's still category 5  
7 after that. Now, we had a hurricane here a few years back,  
8 you've probably heard of it, the hurricane of 1938.

9 And I think most of us in the room probably  
10 weren't here, didn't experience it, and even those who are  
11 old enough to have been around then most probably don't  
12 remember it, there are probably a few exceptions out there,  
13 and it would be good to hear from them. Particularly, in  
14 this period of time right now, with what we're seeing on the  
15 news every night with hurricane Katrina, and what happened  
16 in New Orleans and Mississippi and Alabama, I just don't  
17 know how we can even be thinking about building something  
18 like this in the middle of Long Island Sound.

19 And I just want to say one more thing: the panel  
20 -- one of the panel members mentioned it that the shipping  
21 lane in Long Island Sound has become something akin to I-95.  
22 Well, I just spent the past six years commuting to work on  
23 I-95, 50 miles each way every day, and I certainly don't  
24 want Long Island Sound to turn into I-95. I-95 is clogged,  
25 we need another lane, we can't just put another lane into

1 Long Island Sound, that's something that is just not a  
2 possibility; and so I'll wrap up my remarks with that. And  
3 again thank you for conducting this hearing and thank you to  
4 everyone who's here tonight.

5 MODERATOR MARTIN: Did you write your name?

6 MR. JUTILA: I think I did in the beginning. Ed  
7 Jutila, state representative, 37th District.

8 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. The next speaker  
9 will be Andrea Stillman, state senator.

10 MS. STILLMAN: Good evening. As was stated, I am  
11 Andrea Stillman, I'm the state senator for the 20th  
12 District. I represent the communities of New London,  
13 Waterford East Lyme, Old Lime, and Old Saybrook, as well as  
14 Montville and Salem. The first five communities are  
15 shoreline communities. I welcome you also to my district,  
16 and I feel comfortable in saying that I believe you will  
17 receive some very interesting feedback this evening from the  
18 folks that are here and are pleased that they have an  
19 opportunity to address you.

20 And so with that I also appreciate that  
21 opportunity, and also would like to state that I'm in full  
22 agreement with the Attorney General as well as  
23 Representative Jutila. For the 13 years as a state  
24 legislator, and even longer as a local activist, I've worked  
25 to enhance Long Island Sound and protect it from abuse.

1                   Earlier this year as the senate chair of the  
2   Environment Committee I wrote a bill that became law,  
3   calling for a high-level bi-state taskforce so that New York  
4   and Connecticut can jointly manage their shared resource.  
5   And just last week I was appointed by Governor Rell to her  
6   taskforce to help protect the Sound.

7                   I'm here to express my unwavering opposition To  
8   Broadwater Energy's plan to deface and disgrace Long Island  
9   Sound with a floating 10-story tall liquefied natural gas  
10   terminal. In a word or two, this plan is ill-conceived,  
11   shortsighted and dangerous in my opinion. And to be more  
12   specific it threatens a vital resource that two states have  
13   depended upon for centuries.

14                  I want to highlight four areas in which this  
15   project is untenable and therefore must not be allowed to  
16   stand. We've heard about the height and how dramatic a  
17   facility such as that would be on Long Island Sound, but  
18   also in terms of aesthetics; we know we'll all see it. I  
19   mean, it is a big structure, it would destroy vista scenery,  
20   sunrises and sunsets that have made our state a waterfront  
21   destination for tourists and visitors for generations.

22                  Industrial development of our heretofore  
23   unmolested seascape would be a crippling blow to the  
24   flourishing recreation and tourism economies of Connecticut  
25   communities up and down the state. Secondly, in terms of

1 the environmental and ecological impact, let me suggest this  
2 project, if allowed to go forward, in my estimation would be  
3 a time bomb just waiting to explode.

4 Each of us in this room knows the environmental  
5 calamity that representative Jutila spoke of just a few  
6 weeks ago in the name of hurricane Katrina. Long Island  
7 Sound is not exempt from a comparable storm. This proposed  
8 facility would also by definition attract a fleet of large  
9 tankers as you told us before with hazardous cargo  
10 ratcheting up the likelihood of an accident, and it would be  
11 an obstacle to existing navigation as well.

12 And no one likes to hear the target such a  
13 facility would present to terrorists or would be saboteurs.  
14 I have to think floating all alone out there would be such  
15 an inviting mark for those who are so inclined.

16 Furthermore Connecticut taxpayers have invested  
17 heavily over the past 20 years in the restoration of Long  
18 Island Sound and its water quality. We've done so with  
19 strict enforcement of tougher environmental standards along  
20 the shoreline proper, and we've done so by upgrading and  
21 improving treatment facilities and discharge standards  
22 throughout the state with full knowledge of state drains  
23 into the Sound.

24 This investment made by the taxpayers of the  
25 State of Connecticut must be protected, and conversely must

1 not be permitted to be eroded or compromised in this way.  
2 We've made great strides through the years for a cleaner  
3 Sound. In terms of other commercial uses of the Sound, I'm  
4 convinced this proposed industrial facility would trump the  
5 commercial fishing and recreational boating industries that  
6 have thrived in our state for generations, again with the  
7 potential for ruining the financial fortunes of our small  
8 business owners who make their living off the bounty of Long  
9 Island Sound. Our state's economic well being simply cannot  
10 withstand the assault embodied by Broadwater's proposal.

11 I saw the signal for the minute, and I will wrap  
12 up. There is one issue that I have not addressed in my  
13 written remarks that I will address in future  
14 correspondence, and that's a concern that I have with the  
15 proximity of two nuclear power plants at the entrance of  
16 Long Island Sound. And I personally believe you cannot set  
17 that aside as you look at the safety concerns for this  
18 project and what it could mean to the people in this area.

19 And with all of these comments in mind, I ask  
20 that you deny the Broadwater's plan to go forward, and that  
21 together we work to resolve our energy issues in what I  
22 believe could be a better fashion than the one that's been  
23 proposed, thank you.

24 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next will be Betsy  
25 Ritter, state representative of 38th District, excuse me.

1                   MS. RITTER: Thank you very much, gentlemen, for  
2                   the opportunity to speak to you. For purposes of the  
3                   record, my name is Betsy Ritter, I represent the 38th  
4                   District, I am in the Connecticut Legislature that was of  
5                   the towns of Waterford on the shoreline and Montville.  
6                   You've already been welcomed several times to our community,  
7                   we can't repeat that enough.

8                   I very much appreciate the opportunity that  
9                   you're giving us to come and, in our case, listen to our  
10                  concerns about this project. I think you'll be hearing in  
11                  detail many, many concerns we have about the project. It is  
12                  my hope that many of these concerns are anticipated and that  
13                  there is perhaps a level of understanding which I would  
14                  expect you would have when confronted with a project of this  
15                  size and this gravity.

16                 In my work in the legislature, I sit on the  
17                 Energy and Technology Committee, and I understand well, the  
18                 challenges that face Connecticut as a State in its search  
19                 for energy. We have many challenges ahead of us, and there  
20                 are some things we have done better than others in  
21                 Connecticut in terms of providing that energy. But at the  
22                 same time, it would be irresponsible to look at doing that  
23                 and turn a blind eye to problems that may be associated with  
24                 what looked to be ready solutions to some of those issues.  
25                 And it is largely for those reasons that I also would like

1 to go on record as opposing this project.

2 I understand that it gives us the opportunity to  
3 concentrate a large potential delivery of natural gas to our  
4 area and that this is something we need. But I have grave  
5 concerns about the location of the project in the open water  
6 of Long Island Sound, that again as you have and many of the  
7 speakers before me so well described as a I-95 style  
8 Waterway. I really like that description; it's frightening  
9 however. And I think Representative Jutila spoke to you  
10 pretty clearly about that.

11 There is no point in our creating issues and  
12 problems that we will then have to spend future decades  
13 trying to resolve. And, so often now, today and for many of  
14 the past years, we've spent resolving about issues that we  
15 have created in Long Island Sound. It just does not make  
16 sense.

17 The issue, the second issue, I'd like to speak to  
18 you about energy provision concerns the location near the  
19 power plant. Senator Stillman has described to you very  
20 clearly, we have a lot of concerns. And in Waterford, my  
21 community, where the nuclear power plant is housed, we have  
22 particular concerns about a very large potentially explosive  
23 facility so close. I know the term ground-zero is used  
24 perhaps now in common conversation everyday. I can't think  
25 of a more adequate description of what could possibly happen

1       there than to state that, we would be creating a real  
2       opportunity for a total ground-zero devastation in this  
3       area, and that is a major concern as well.

4               In your publication that we received calling us  
5       for this meeting, I see that you well identified current  
6       environmental issues. The first of those; conversion of the  
7       project area from open water to an energy facility or an  
8       industrialization of Long Island Sound would be my third  
9       area of major concern about this project. As I alluded to  
10      before, we've spent decades undoing damage to Long Island  
11      Sound and the waterways that have made the State of  
12      Connecticut such a beautiful State and have become one of  
13      our most precious assets; to willingly step of the  
14      precipice, as the Attorney General said, towards an  
15      industrialization of this area is a decision I think that is  
16      a very grave and certainly deserves a lot of careful  
17      consideration.

18             I want to thank you for the time you're putting  
19      into this. You'll be hearing about a lot more of these  
20      issues. We very much appreciate your time and attention.  
21      Thank you.

22             MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. For my first test,  
23      Louise from Peoplewitz(phonetic).

24             MS. LOUISE: Good evening. I am opposed to the  
25      Broadwater LNG project being proposed by the Federal

1 Government on behalf of the TransCanada and Shell  
2 Corporations for development in Long Island Sound.  
3 Beautiful Long Island Sound is a vast and abundant natural  
4 resource providing water dependant recreational and economic  
5 opportunities to the one in ten Americans who live within a  
6 50 mile radius of its shores. In addition it is a sanctuary  
7 providing food and shelter to a great variety of marine  
8 life.

9 This whole idea doesn't make sense. It runs  
10 counter to the efforts of the States of Connecticut, New  
11 York, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency,  
12 who have been working together on long range plans to  
13 restore the health of Long Island Sound by making its waters  
14 cleaner and healthier, its living resources more abundant  
15 and diverse, and its economic and recreational worse even  
16 more valuable.

17 For starters, the proposed facility would be  
18 ugly. It would be 75 to a 100 feet tall and the length of 4  
19 football fields. The construction of this huge liquid  
20 natural gas storage facility would rest right smack in the  
21 middle of our beautiful Long Island Sound. The construction  
22 of such a facility poses an imminent threat to the well  
23 being of the millions of inhabitants who live in close  
24 proximity of the coastal regions many of us call home.

25 The unknown environmental ramifications of the

1 installation of this project, in light of terrorism and  
2 natural disasters, could be massive, and the threat of  
3 spills and run offs would affect humans and marine wildlife  
4 alike and upset the fragile coastal ecosystems.

5 The installation of a natural gas storage  
6 facility in the middle of Long Island Sound is not  
7 environmentally sustainable. It would set a dangerous  
8 precedent, allowing the industrialization of Long Island  
9 Sound and corporate control of its natural resources. As  
10 caring humans we have an obligation to protect Long Island  
11 Sound for the benefit of our children and for future  
12 generations. Thank you.

13 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next speaker will  
14 be Edward Purcell.

15 MR. PURCELL: Good afternoon.

16 MODERATOR MARTIN: And my apologies to Mr.  
17 Purcell. The sign was sitting on top of his name, he should  
18 have been the previous speaker.

19 MR. PURCELL: My name is Edward Purcell, and I  
20 live in Mystic, Connecticut. Thank you, very much for the  
21 opportunity to speak on this issue. There are many reasons  
22 for me to oppose an LNG platform on Long Island Sound. It  
23 would be ugly in the midst of our beautiful fine piece of  
24 water, and I suggest you all read that book if you have not  
25 already by that title. This will also require an underwater

1 pipeline which will rip up the seabed and create havoc for  
2 all living things in its way.

3 And, there are many other reasons of that nature  
4 environmentally that I could go on but I know they will be  
5 covered by other people. So, for now I'm going to limit my  
6 criticism for the public safety issues involved with this  
7 site.

8 As stated before, this loading platform is about  
9 1200 feet long, 180 feet wide, and ten stories high. What a  
10 target for a terrorist? Every weekend you can see 40-foot  
11 speedboats cruising down the Sound at 50 knots, and who can  
12 tell which one of them is loaded with explosives? Not a  
13 hypothetical situation anymore.

14 The Coast Guard doesn't have the resources to  
15 stop and check all of these boats everyday. And it only  
16 takes one terrorist to cause the biggest explosion  
17 Connecticut has ever seen. As an aside, specifically to the  
18 Coast Guard representatives here, PAWSA should have a  
19 representative from NYPD Counter Terrorism Office. Not just  
20 from the police department but specifically from the Counter  
21 Terrorism Office.

22 The Coast Guard also has done studies of attack  
23 scenarios in the past for the protection of LNG tankers in  
24 Boston Harbor. And once again I address this to the Coast  
25 Guard members present, because it is likely that these

1 studies are seriously flawed because they assume that the  
2 attackers will maintain constant course and speed. And in  
3 fact the results of one of those studies was used to help  
4 headquarters in one of the largest small boat procurements  
5 ever undertaken for small response boat and the conclusions  
6 of that flawed study were used to determine the appropriate  
7 speed of the craft that was purchased. And of course that  
8 was a multi-million dollar contract because we now have  
9 those boats, fortunately all throughout the United States in  
10 almost every harbor.

11 And how could the Coast Guard protect this  
12 proposed platform? And, perhaps they might first tell us if  
13 they even consider it their job to do so. And, if they do,  
14 it will take several patrol crafts, on station, 24/7, with  
15 advanced weapons to stop just one of these attacks.

16 And, once again the Coast Guard doesn't have the  
17 resources available to guard commercial property of this  
18 size. Now, I don't want to antagonize all the people who  
19 are saying, "Don't, don't, don't, don't, don't, do it." But  
20 if it is deemed by FERC, that this must be built, I suggest  
21 that it be land based on the western end of the Sound, where  
22 it will be much easier for the owner to protect it and be  
23 able to provide the LNG to New York, which needs it most.

24 There is no reason why the State of Connecticut  
25 should have to bear the consequences of this proposal which

1 is designed to satisfy the insatiable appetite of others.  
2 And, as I've said in previous statements that I had sent to  
3 local newspapers, this is a really dumb idea.

4 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next is Bill  
5 McCue.

6 MR. MCCUE: Thank you for giving me this  
7 opportunity to address you this evening. My name is Bill  
8 McCue. I'm a U.S. Coast Guard licensed professional  
9 mariner. And, I've served aboard LNG carriers for well over  
10 a decade. Our responsibilities have included navigating  
11 these vessels through the most congested waterways in the  
12 world, to being the person in charge of cargo transfer  
13 operations. With proper planning, equipment and qualified  
14 labor, liquefied natural gas can be transported and stored  
15 safely. I've worked with hundreds of engineers and deck  
16 officers over my career.

17 When it comes to LNG, it's safety first and  
18 foremost. I am confident that Broadwater's FSRU project  
19 will include the highest level of skilled personnel  
20 operating the ships and the re-gasification plant. In  
21 closing, during the early stages of my sea going career, I  
22 made many deliveries of SICs oil, to the then  
23 Lukal(phonetic) platform in Long Island Sound.

24 I can honestly say that I'm far more comfortable  
25 with an FSRU facility operating in the area. We are all

1 consumers of energy, and therefore it is our obligation to  
2 consider this proposal from an educated prospective.

3 LNG is a clean, efficient, and when handled  
4 correctly, extremely safe energy source. I address all  
5 citizens here tonight including the Coast Guard and the  
6 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to consider my comments  
7 when reviewing the Broadwater application. Thank you for  
8 your time.

9 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you, for your comments.  
10 Next will be John Andrews.

11 MR. ANDREWS: Thank you for having me here. Good  
12 evening, my name is John Andrews. I am a U.S. Coast Guard  
13 licensed chief engineer, and I've worked on liquid natural  
14 gas vessels for well over 20 years. I started my career on  
15 LNG tankers with the El Paso Natural Gas Company out of  
16 Texas. El Paso ran membrane-type LNG vessels, which protect  
17 the LNG cargo tanks by a series of two steel hulls, also  
18 wood(?) insulation of about one meter thick, and 2 membranes,  
19 stainless steel back to back with an angular space. For  
20 approximately 15 years, I worked on LNG tankers, after that  
21 for the New York based Energy Transportation Corporation,  
22 and then Pronav Ships Management of Greenwich, Connecticut.

23 Over my 20 years as a shipboard engineer on LNG  
24 carriers, I have been responsible for all aspects of the  
25 safe and secure handling of LNG. The transportation of LNG

1 has an excellent safety record and environmental record. I  
2 believe that LNG carriers are the safest type of tanker  
3 vessels provided that qualified people operate the vessels.  
4 I have been through every nook and cranny of LNG carriers,  
5 whether at sea, during the construction and building phases  
6 of LNG vessels in shipyards, and during scheduled  
7 maintenance overhauls in ports all over the world.

8 Broadwater's re-gasification plant will be  
9 considered a stationary ship. Indeed the American Bureau of  
10 Shipping has been involved with the plans and specifications  
11 for the FSRU. The proposed Broadwater FSRU would be  
12 constructed at a shipyard, towed to a site in the Sound and  
13 attached to a yoke mooring system, which would be supported  
14 by a tower structure. The yoke will be designed to hold  
15 both the FSRU and the LNG carrier. The yoke is a well-  
16 proven technology and will be designed to hold a FSRU even  
17 during the most severe conditions that would be experienced  
18 in the Sound. As I have stated, natural gas is safe to  
19 transport and store, provided that there are qualified and  
20 well-trained people handling and transporting it.

21 Throughout my career, the corporate officials who  
22 own the LNG carriers, amongst guest, dignitaries and  
23 families of the --- when on board, had no problem ever  
24 sailing aboard the vessels. That means a lot because that  
25 shows that the corporations and more importantly the

1 insurance underwriters, believe the ships were being  
2 operated safely and that the carriage of LNG can indeed be  
3 handled and transported safely.

4 I hope that FERC will consider my comments on the  
5 safety and security of LNG transportation operations as it  
6 considers the Broadwater application. Thank you.

7 SPEAKER: Where are you from?

8 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you.

9 MR. ANDREWS: Well, and I ship all over the  
10 country. I didn't know, whole different place.

11 SPEAKER: Where's your home?

12 MR. ANDREWS: Right now I'm retired. I'm just  
13 living in Albuquerque, Pennsylvania, but I'm originally  
14 from --

15 MODERATOR MARTIN: Ladies and gentlemen, next  
16 speaker will be Josephine Collymore (phonetic).

17 MS. COLLYMORE: Thank you. I need not speak  
18 much. My concerns have been addressed, thank you.

19 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next will be Jack  
20 Dooley.

21 MR. DOOLEY: Good evening and thank you, Mr.  
22 Martin and Capt. Boynton. I'm Jack Dooley, fourth  
23 generation summer resident of Old Lyme, Connecticut.  
24 Actually, I'm the third, my 23-year-old daughter is fourth  
25 generation. We've been there since 1927. I have some

1       limited knowledge, probably not experts like these so called  
2       sea captains here, but I have some limited knowledge of  
3       marine construction geology environmental issues. Just  
4       enough to know that a project like this presents many, many  
5       risks.

6               As the gentleman before me spoke, that it's safe  
7       and so forth secure if it is staffed by the right people.  
8       That's a very, very big if. There is some risk -- I'll  
9       leave the threat of terrorism and stuff to the other  
10      speakers, I'm not even going to address that in  
11      environmental issues.

12             But I'm wondering about during the transfer from  
13      the ships that are coming in to the platform, about risks.  
14      I'm wondering about navigational hazards -- That's already  
15      been addressed. Many, many more ships than I was ever aware  
16      of in Long Island Sound -- and whether the ships going  
17      through navigational transfers going in and out of the Sound  
18      and so forth and so on, and that barrier, a balloon as was  
19      mentioned around the ships, you know, if that's violated or  
20      we do have ferry services, you people know, crossing the  
21      Sound and stuff. Equipment malfunctions; I happen to work  
22      for Pratt Whitney in the aircraft industry, final inspection  
23      on commercial and military engines in the Middle Town,  
24      Connecticut. And. God forbid, when I put my sticker on an  
25      engine, I'm hoping it flies, everything goes all right. But

1       once in a blue moon something goes wrong; it may be as much  
2       as a leak, hopefully it's not catastrophic. But this risk  
3       of the Sound, in Long Island Sound, there's basically one  
4       way to get in and out lest you go through Hell's gate down  
5       into East river. The way in and out is through New London.

6               If there was a catastrophe, the access to the  
7       Sound I believe is too narrow to put something in like this.  
8       It'd block off the whole Sound if there was a catastrophe. I  
9       experienced a 4-inch natural gas leak at a local school when  
10      my parents lived in Hartford. It was about a half a mile  
11      away, it sounded like a jet engine whistle going off. It  
12      sounded --- it was a 4 inch gas line that broke in a school;  
13      12 blocks had to be evacuated until the gas was turned off.  
14      Natural disasters, we've talked about already, the  
15      possibility of the barge breaking away from a mooring,  
16      whether it's a cradle or otherwise. Yes, they say they are  
17      good; how good? They've been proven? We saw a 35,000-ton  
18      rig in Mobile Bay bump into the I-10 bridge during the last  
19      hurricane. Could this possibly break away and drift into  
20      New Haven or drift into Long Island or drift somewhere, with  
21      how many millions of gallons or cubic feet of natural gas in  
22      it?

23              With the growing megalopolis around New York and  
24      the whole northeast area, it's just only the first of a  
25      whole series of barges or platforms ever. So, eventually, I

1       could drive my mountain bike from Brantford over to Long  
2       Island, on a series of barges.

3               Is this just the first hole in the den? I'm  
4       asking everybody to consider this.

5               SPEAKER:   Yes.

6               MR. DOOLEY:  I'm just skipping over a couple of  
7       things here that've already been addressed too.  And, is  
8       this the same group or conglomerate that placed that  
9       substandard pipe across the Long Island Sound?  As I  
10      understand, it was supposed to be buried to a certain areas.  
11      Somebody said, "Oh, it's very standard." I understand it's  
12      not standard depth that there was a shelf that they hit,  
13      they didn't want to go through it, and they laid it over  
14      that shelf.  I'm not sure of the exact details but I  
15      understand a little bit about it.  Is this the same group,  
16      is this the same type of quality control that will be  
17      presented and demonstrated on this platform?  Does the same  
18      group, as I understand, expects to build in our Sound?  If  
19      so, I'm firmly against this project.  Thank you for your  
20      time.

21               (APPLAUSE)

22               MODERATOR MARTIN:  Thank you.  Next will be  
23      Norris McDonald.

24               MR. MCDONALD:  Good evening.  My name is Norris  
25      McDonald.  I'm founder and president of the African-American

1 Environmentalists Association. We're very small, middle  
2 environmental group. We address national issues. We're a  
3 little volunteer group. We also have an office based in the  
4 Bronx; that's our regional and local office here. Our  
5 person there is out of town and I'm happy to be here to talk  
6 about this issue. I have 2 short paragraphs to read out in  
7 my written --- in my verbal statement and then I'm going to  
8 speak to the issues of concern to us.

9           The reality of the electricity generation -- and  
10 I'm sorry, our comments tonight are directed towards FERC  
11 and along the lines of energy and electricity. The reality  
12 of electricity generation in America today is that natural  
13 gas power plants are the only facilities that can be  
14 approved for construction in today's "not in my backyard"  
15 climate. Although coal provides 50 percent of electricity  
16 generation and nuclear provides another 20 percent, public  
17 opposition is significantly limiting the use of these fuels.

18           Natural gas provides about 20 percent of the  
19 fuels used to generate electricity in the United States.  
20 But it is the cleanest burning fossil fuel: for this reason  
21 it is the fossil fuel of choice for utilities, environmental  
22 groups, regulators and the general public. Unfortunately  
23 New York and Connecticut do not have sufficient local supply  
24 and domestic and Canadian supplies are in high demand all  
25 over the country. Limited supplies and increasing demand

1 are leading to price volatility. The solution is to import  
2 LNG from nations with abundant supplies of natural gas.

3 If capacity is not increased by importing more  
4 gas, building larger pipelines and exploring for additional  
5 sources of natural gas, America will continue to demand gas,  
6 put pressure on the supply side and continue to drive up the  
7 price of natural gas.

8 Second paragraph and I'll be --- speak to my  
9 issues. Connecticut is at a crossroads in terms of  
10 providing its citizens with reliable electricity.  
11 Connecticut is not sure about nuclear power, it cannot  
12 afford to continue to use oil to produce electricity.  
13 Natural gas supplies are tight, which is leading to price  
14 volatility. The State does not use much coal to produce  
15 electricity, and the Clean Air Act regulations and climate  
16 change considerations, probably rule out significant  
17 additional use of coal. Wind and affordable take power will  
18 have to be backed up with reliable sources of electricity,  
19 and the State is using about as much hydropower as it is  
20 available for use. Connecticut has to make up its mind now  
21 to assure dependable electricity 10 years from now. I have  
22 the mix of -- the fuel mix for generating electricity: about  
23 43 percent oil gas, 9 percent coal, 3 percent refuse tires,  
24 32 percent nuclear --- that's down from 45 percent because  
25 some units have been taken out of commission --2 percent

1 hydro and 11 percent gas-oil."

2 But the basic point with Connecticut is,  
3 Connecticut has a renewables on portfolio standard.  
4 Connecticut also has a climate change plan. And, America  
5 wants to address the climate change and renewables portfolio  
6 standards. I had the privilege of attending the signing of  
7 the Energy Bill, plus we're intimately sensitive to climate  
8 change. And I will hope that the EIS, the draft EIS will  
9 address the electricity needs of the country in a climate  
10 changing climate.

11 The problem is with electricity interconnect,  
12 trying to get electricity imported in. It appears that  
13 everybody wants big homes, big SUV homes, electricity grows  
14 in the United States at the rate of about 2 percent per  
15 year, we're going to grow, we're going to have electricity.  
16 But at the same time, people are concerned about climate  
17 change. People are talking about they --- they are creating  
18 larger hurricanes. But at the same time, we want to protect  
19 the environment.

20 I love the Sound. I'm a boater. Love the  
21 environment. But we want it both ways in Connecticut and  
22 nationally. We want to protect everything in sight, yet we  
23 want to use up all the electricity we can. We want to have  
24 these big homes in the suburbs and I met many people here  
25 tonight that have these big homes, yet they also want to

1 protect the Sound.

2 So, you do have to make up your mind and that is  
3 our concern. Our concern in America is that we do want it  
4 both ways and in Connecticut and in New York, all of this  
5 electricity use. Now, the problem is with wind and solar.  
6 I love wind and solar. I testified at the Cape Wind Project  
7 up in Nantucket Sound. A huge protest up there, 600 people,  
8 300 for, 300 against.

9 Photovoltaic, I have two with photovoltaic  
10 plants, manufacturing plants. But these facilities are  
11 intermittent. On windless nights you're not going to get  
12 any power, so they have to be backed up anyway. What will  
13 they be backed up with? They'll probably be backed up with  
14 natural gas plants. So, we have to make up our minds here,  
15 I mean we have to use something. And, also this is a great  
16 State; we supported McCain-Lieberman, the climate change, I  
17 mean, innovation act. We thought it was a great Act.  
18 Connecticut is in the forefront of energy policy and we  
19 supported that Act. But we cannot have it both ways. My  
20 personal concern is that I'm a chronic acute asthmatic and  
21 I've almost died twice from asthma attacks.

22 Not only will climate change or climate warming  
23 probably create more powerful hurricanes, which we're  
24 worried about now, but we feel as though, climate change,  
25 climate warming will also create a more serious smog. Smog

1 is bad today, in New York, in the region, non attainment  
2 area.

3 We're just concerned that's it going to cook up a  
4 hotter, more dangerous smog and increase climate change,  
5 more hurricanes. So, we can't have it both ways. We can't  
6 keep everything completely pristine and also use all the  
7 electricity we want in the United States, thank you. And we  
8 support the project by the way. I left that out, we do  
9 support the project for all of these reasons that I just  
10 mentioned. Thank you.

11 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you.

12 SPEAKER: But doesn't -- doesn't burning methane  
13 gas also produce carbon dioxide and which is essentially the  
14 main reason for ---

15 MODERATOR MARTIN: We're going to have your  
16 comments at the podium, if we -- we can't think we can  
17 answer that, without having you speaking ---

18 SPEAKER: Okay. I wasn't clear when he was  
19 speaking about ---

20 MR. MCDONALD: My only concern there is that coal  
21 uses twice as much carbon dioxide, generates twice as much  
22 carbon dioxide compared to natural gas. That's why we like  
23 the need-to-use basis, you get half the carbon dioxide  
24 amount burning natural gas to produce electricity as you  
25 would from a coal plant.

1                   SPEAKER: Just wanted to address --

2                   MODERATOR MARTIN: Okay, thank you.

3                   SPEAKER: Just identify where they live --

4                   MODERATOR MARTIN: I understand the, you know the  
5 concern that there might be folks from outside the community  
6 talking but we -- we did not have any prohibition on people  
7 coming from anywhere to speak to us.

8                   SPEAKER: I'm not asking that they be  
9 prohibited --

10                  MODERATOR MARTIN: I would say that the next  
11 speaker wants to tell us where they live then they are more  
12 than welcome to do that. Next speaker will be Seb Morton.

13                  MR. MORTON: Good evening, and like the other  
14 speakers, I am honored to be here and have a chance to speak  
15 my mind. I am a physician, and also have a doctorate in  
16 environmental health science. But that's not who I am  
17 tonight speaking. Basically, the person that's here is a  
18 55-year-old person who was born and raised in Hartford,  
19 Connecticut, and spent every summer along Long Island Sound  
20 and old Saybrook Connecticut.

21                  And I don't know if the people here have had a  
22 chance to see Old Lyme and Old Saybrook; it is a unique area  
23 in the United States as far as I know. And I've been around  
24 a bit. You have the Connecticut River which never got  
25 developed, thanks to a shoal that has limited shipping in

1 the 18th to 19th century and 20th century. And you have  
2 Long Island Sound which is a very sensitive, ecological  
3 area, and for many years, it has been kept pristine,  
4 basically.

5 There has been a lot of effort in the 30 or 40,  
6 past 30 or 40 years to clean up the Sound. I remember when  
7 I was a kid, I saw more pieces of toilet paper coming down  
8 the Connecticut river into Long Island Sound than I saw  
9 Eagles, or Ospreys, or Herons. Now, I said the ratio goes  
10 the other way. You can start seeing Eagles and other birds  
11 migrating to the other places, landing in the Sound.

12 And my question basically has to do with, do we  
13 really want to turn Long Island Sound in the Connecticut  
14 Long Island shore into an Elizabeth, New Jersey? I spent 20  
15 years in New Jersey, and I can tell you I have never ever,  
16 ever, seen a Heron, an Osprey, or an Eagle in Elizabeth, New  
17 Jersey. And I really don't want to see that happen to Long  
18 Island Sound. I moved back to Connecticut because I like  
19 the Sound, I like it the way it is, I don't want to see it  
20 industrialized.

21 I am also aware of the story of Pandora's box;  
22 once you open it and you start with the first, LNG or what  
23 have you, tank farm or whatever, out in the middle of the  
24 Sound, you know, the next one becomes so much easier. And  
25 personally I am opposed to it; I think there are many

1 environmental issues that have to be addressed, and safety  
2 issues.

3 I heard people telling me how safe it is, and I  
4 am sure these people that are Coast Guard trained or  
5 whatever, Captains of these vessels, can speak of safety.  
6 But you know what? I could talk to the people who flew  
7 those four planes 9/11, and I am sure that Boeing builds  
8 very safe planes, I am sure those pilots were trained very  
9 well, I am sure those stewardess knew everything about how  
10 to take care of a crash situation.

11 But you know what? Those planes went down any  
12 way. It wasn't because of their structural problems or  
13 their training; it had to do with an overt action of  
14 terrorism. And that's what I am afraid of. Okay, you are  
15 putting another target, along with the nuclear power plants  
16 that are here, along with -- pardon me -- grotten(phonetic)  
17 which is here, to attract something. And I think a disaster  
18 here would be just unbelievable in its magnitude.

19 I saw just, when I was in New Jersey as I said,  
20 there was a gas explosion in Edison which killed about two-  
21 dozen people, and I went there and the place was flattened  
22 as if an atomic bomb had gone off. So when people say,  
23 safety in its liquid state, t-dah, t-dah -- don't hedge  
24 around the thing. If it wasn't such a gas -- if it wasn't  
25 such an explosive potential, then why are people putting

1 safety bubbles around it and putting -- want to put it --  
2 putting it out 10 miles out to sea.

3 There is a safety issue, and when you discuss  
4 risk, you know, the people on 9/11, around New York and  
5 Manhattan at 7:30 in the morning would have said, "You know  
6 what, the risk of somebody blowing up the towers is -- soo  
7 small", you come back at 10:00 o'clock, and they probably  
8 have a different answer for you. So, again I am opposed to  
9 it, all categories. Thank you.

10 (Applause)

11 MODERATOR MARTIN: The next speaker will be Mike  
12 Lesley.

13 MR. LESLEY: Good evening, I want to pretty much  
14 to say what the gentleman said a couple of times -- a couple  
15 of those speakers before. I am another US Coast Guard,  
16 licensed Chief Engineer. I worked on the LNG or Liquefied  
17 Natural Gas vessels for over 20 years. Over 20 years, as a  
18 shipboard engineer on LNG carriers, I have been responsible  
19 for all aspects of the safe and secure handling of LNG.

20 During this period, the fleet 8 LNG ships that I  
21 worked in connection with had an impeccable safety record.  
22 In fact, in over 40 years of world wide commercial LNG  
23 operation, there has never been a serious incident resulting  
24 in the loss of cargo. The transportation of LNG has an  
25 excellent safety and environmental record when compared to

1 the safety and the environmental records of ships and barges  
2 that carry liquid petroleum such as gasoline, lube oil,  
3 diesel fuel and heavy bunker C.

4 For all intents and purposes I consider  
5 Broadwater's re-gasification plant to be a stationary ship.  
6 The manning requirements will be very similar. That is, the  
7 monitoring of the LNG will be on a perpetual basis; the only  
8 difference between the LNG ship and a re-gasification plant  
9 is that a ship that has a propulsion system that allows it  
10 to move from point A to point B.

11 On board LNG vessels, there is machinery and  
12 equipment associated with keeping the natural gas in a  
13 liquid state; on Broadwater's re-gasification plant, there  
14 is also varying type machinery and equipment that will be  
15 used to change the liquid back into natural gas equipment  
16 similar to that found on an LNG ship.

17 It is also my understanding of the proposed  
18 Broadwater FSRU would be constructed using proven technology  
19 and will be designed to hold the FSRU, even during the most  
20 severe conditions that would be experienced in the Sound.  
21 As I have stated, liquefied natural gas is safe to transport  
22 and store, provided that there are qualified people tasked  
23 with this oversight.

24 Over the years, people have asked me whether I  
25 felt safe, sailing aboard an LNG carrier? My answer is that

1 I often felt safer working onboard an LNG ship traveling  
2 across the seas from terminal to terminal than I do when  
3 riding in a car on any American highway. I hope FERC will  
4 consider my comments on the safety and security of LNG  
5 transportation operations as it considers the Broadwater  
6 Application. Thank you.

7 SPEAKER: Sir, may we ask where your home is?

8 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you, the next speaker  
9 will be Molly McKay.

10 MS. MCKAY: My name is Molly McKay, I am here  
11 representing the Connecticut Chapter of the Sierra Club. I  
12 am Transportation Chair of the Connecticut Chapter. And we  
13 have 13,000 members in Connecticut. The club has voted to  
14 oppose this project, but we do understand that we are in a  
15 conundrum in our society because we need electricity.

16 We are aware that natural gas, is a far cleaner  
17 fuel than others. But we are opposed to the location of  
18 this facility. I understand that an environmental impact  
19 statement is at the draft that's coming up soon or the -- of  
20 the final. Are they in the process of the draft? EIS?

21 MODERATOR MARTIN: We'll receive an application  
22 and then issue a draft after that, and then after the draft  
23 the final.

24 MS. MCKAY: It's my understanding that now and  
25 the EIS should have an analysis of the full range of

1 alternatives of what they are going to do -- for the  
2 purpose, a need of this facility, there should be a good  
3 analysis of the alternatives rather than just one location.  
4 So, I'll be interested to see what those analyses are.

5           It's already been said, but I wrote here that the  
6 Long Island Sound is an estuary of national significance,  
7 and as has already been said tens of millions of tax dollars  
8 has gone in to the stewardship of the Sound, to restoring it  
9 to a cleaner State than has been in the past. And there is  
10 a great deal of money committed as we go forward to that  
11 purpose.

12           There are a number of environmental issues that I  
13 have read about that I'd like to raise.

14           7000 square feet of sea floor will be covered by  
15 the mooring platform, and the 25 miles of pipeline will  
16 require a great deal of ditching and -- which gives so much  
17 disturbance to the sediment, and it breaks down the organic  
18 matter, and the result of that is degrading water quality,  
19 partly because there is a decreasing amount of oxygen.

20           So, that's been having a very harmful effect on  
21 the Shellfish and othe floor dwellers of the Sound. Also,  
22 the last pipeline project failed to meet the environmental  
23 standards and was only turned on under political pressure  
24 from the White House. So, we have yet to figure out just  
25 how to do pipelines in a very clean way, and very risky that

1 we may not be able to do that.

2 Also, uses of seawater, when they are testing the  
3 facility and the use of water for ballast, will involve  
4 harmful chemicals, and that's what's called drawn in water,  
5 which will be destructive to fish and other organisms.  
6 Threatened and endangered species are in the Sound all  
7 through the late spring and into the fall. And there is  
8 promises made by Broadwater to protect the species but the  
9 promises just don't sound very convincing.

10 Light pollution has a devastating effect on  
11 wildlife, it's very disruptive to their patterns, their 24  
12 hours patterns of the living, it's also a risk to migratory  
13 birds flying into their facility, and being also disrupted  
14 by the light. There is also untold damage that will come  
15 from water discharges, sewage wastewater treatment, storm  
16 water runoff, and potential liquid natural gas spills.

17 I've also read that this terminal won't reduce  
18 air pollution because it's not going to be replaced existing  
19 plants which are environmentally damaging at this time.  
20 Potential explosions have been brought up, that's a risk  
21 which would be both for safety and environmental concern.  
22 And also will emit carbon dioxide into the atmosphere.

23 This is an ill-conceived project with many  
24 foreseeable and unforeseen threats on one of the most  
25 beautiful and important bodies of water in the United

1 States. It is not a water-dependent development and it  
2 should not be placed in a national treasure. Thank you.

3 (Applause)

4 MODERATOR MARTIN: The next speaker will be Ray  
5 Collins (phonetic).

6  
7 MR. COLLINS: I thank you for your time, sharing  
8 your time with us. My name is Ray Collins. I am from Old  
9 Saybrook. I'd like to express some of my concerns. I was  
10 hoping there would be more details on the floating zone of  
11 protection; I am a little bit concerned about that. I am a  
12 sailor, I sail out of Old Lyme. I believe I heard someone  
13 say that there'll be three or four ships a week. That would  
14 mean that I and those ships are going to be converging  
15 frequently. Concerned about the race. I sail through the  
16 race on the tide. I have a sailboat, I can't crank that son  
17 of a gun up to 18 knots to get out of the way of anybody as  
18 much as I try.

19 What are the ramifications? As a former Coast  
20 Guardsman, I consider myself a safe and courteous boater. I  
21 stay out of the shipping channels. I stay away from all  
22 commercial traffic whether it's ships, tugs, lobstermen,  
23 draggers, you name it, even the headboats. I am concerned  
24 of getting far enough away in this zone protection will not  
25 be a problem. I 'm also concerned as one of my jobs when I

1 was young, very young, was as a mate on a dragger. How does  
2 this effect someone who is out there doing that? I also  
3 worked on a lobster boat. How does it affect the guys on  
4 the lobster boats who are working their gear. What kind of  
5 a notification -- I've heard rumor had it, that there was  
6 going to be little or if any notification of these zones  
7 coming in. How do you plan your day?

8 Does Broadwater plan on financial remuneration  
9 for these folks? Additionally, I was a State Representative  
10 for 18 years representing Milford, West Haven, and Orange.  
11 I was on the environment committee for those 18 years. I  
12 watched the Iroquois pipeline being built in front of my  
13 house, which was directly under water in West Haven. At the  
14 time they said it would be returned to its natural state  
15 within two years. If you send the diver down today, you'll  
16 find that it is a desert for about a 150 feet. That was not  
17 what was promised and yet that's what we have.

18 I was a Republican for those 18 years. I would  
19 like to say that I concur with Senator Stillman and the  
20 Attorney General Blumenthal to show you that there is  
21 bipartisan support for what they had to say. I also would  
22 like to point that the folks who worked the ships, worked  
23 the ships on land based plants, when they came in, not on a  
24 floating facility. This is the first of its kind; I have  
25 real concerns about that. We spent a lot of money in the

1 State of Connecticut to improve the Sound. I'm very proud  
2 of being a part of that. We spent a lot of money and fixed  
3 up the sewage treatment plants. The communities had spent a  
4 lot of money. We've put in a lot of effort, lot of  
5 publicity. And I am scared to death of what will happen  
6 should something really drastic happen to this plant. It  
7 really, really scares me. Thank you.

8 (Applause)

9 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next would be Doug  
10 VanNewman.

11 MR. VANNEWMAN: My name is Doug VanNewman. I'm a  
12 certified chief engineer and cargo engineer for LNG  
13 operations. I support the use the Broadwater's re-  
14 gasification plant because I believe it to be safer than  
15 nuclear power plants and environmentally better than coal  
16 burning facilities. Natural gas is a more efficient energy  
17 source as well. Each LNG vessel carries sufficient natural  
18 gas to power needs of a city of 75,000 for one year. Unlike  
19 oil, there is no residue. LNG just vaporizes and becomes  
20 lighter than air.

21 I support the Broadwater Terminal Port Project  
22 because LNG transportation has been proven to be safe. I  
23 began my career in the late 1980 on LNG ships. I have over  
24 18 years experience transporting LNG from the liquification  
25 terminals to re-gasification terminals worldwide. I sailed

1 with Energy Transport Corporation for 15 years transporting  
2 LNG from Indonesia to Japan. I spent another four years  
3 sailing with Aronkeel (phoetic) transporting LNG to the  
4 United States, Europe and Asia. During our tour of duty,  
5 usually six months a year, the wives and children of the  
6 ship-board officers frequently traveled with us during  
7 portions of the tour.

8 We believe it to be safer boarding LNG tanker  
9 than walking the streets back home so long as the people  
10 handling and transporting the natural gas have the requisite  
11 training and qualifications. Broadwater's re-gasification  
12 and storage facility is in essence just an LNG ship, except  
13 for some minor points. Instead of a facility being a ship  
14 moving from port to port, it's a stationary waterborne  
15 structure, like in a ship at anchor.

16 The facility would still receive and store the  
17 LNG but with the capability to convert the LNG back into a  
18 gas before it's sent to the New York and Connecticut markets  
19 via the existing iroquois pipeline which crosses Long Island  
20 Sound from Milford, Connecticut to North Port, New York.

21 Like a ship, the Broadwater re-gasification plant  
22 would have housing on board. That plant would need to be  
23 manned by professional workers on a watch type rotation, day  
24 in and day out, just like a ship. The equipment and  
25 machinery on board the re-gasification facility would either

1 be the same or nearly identical to the type of marine  
2 equipment and machinery on board a ship. The Broadwater re-  
3 gasification and storage facility as well as the  
4 transportation of LNG to the facility can be achieved in a  
5 safe manner provided there are qualified personnel operate  
6 the facility. What better way exists to grantee that safety  
7 and the security of these vessels than to crew them with  
8 Americans, certified by the U.S. Coast Guard, now part of  
9 Homeland Defense.

10 There are hundreds of active officers in the  
11 American Merchant Marine who like me have decades of  
12 experience in the safe and reliable transportation of LNG.  
13 I believe I can speak not only for myself but for my  
14 shipmates in LNG transportation who would welcome the  
15 opportunity to serve their country by working to guarantee  
16 safe delivery and storage of LNG to the Broadwater Terminal  
17 Port Project. I hope that the FERC will consider my  
18 comments on the safety and security of LNG transportation  
19 operations as it concerns this Broadwater application.  
20 Thank you.

21 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next speaker will  
22 be John Egan.

23 MR. EGAN: Good evening, gentlemen, thank you  
24 very much for the opportunity to speak. My name is John  
25 Egan. I live in Norwich, Connecticut. I'm a boater. I

1 boat on Long Island Sound. My son and daughter-in-law who  
2 live in New London, near Ocean Beach. I am also a retired  
3 merchant marine officer. I am surprised there are so many  
4 of you guys here, this wasn't planned. I spent 21 years  
5 working with aboard LNG carriers, 15 years as Chief Officer,  
6 6 years as Master. I've personally undertaken over 400  
7 flows and discharges, as Chief Officer on board in the LNG  
8 ships. In addition to that I've also spent two years at the  
9 Cove Point LNG facility operated by the Dominion located in  
10 Wesley, Maryland, on the western shores of the Chesapeake  
11 Bay; another one of the national treasures of our waters.

12 This facility is located approximately; the berth  
13 is located approximately a mile and quarter offshore.  
14 During that period of time, I personally attended 143  
15 discharges of LNG ships coming into that facility. I've  
16 worked closely with the Captain of the Port, sector  
17 Baltimore and Sector Hamptonrose. I've attended numerous  
18 court hearings, Coast Guard hearings. The security that --  
19 and it's a touchy area because we get into SSI -- but I can  
20 personally attest to the fact that the security measures  
21 that are taken at the Dominion Port Point LNG facility are  
22 excellent. This information unfortunately cannot be made  
23 public.

24 That unfortunately causes some concern for  
25 citizens, and I can understand that. But I would hope that

1       they would have the confidence in the Department of Homeland  
2       Security and the Coast Guard. When the Coast Guard has  
3       their hearings, or when they have their assessments, it just  
4       isn't the Coast Guards sitting here as the captain said.  
5       There are members of other law enforcement agencies there as  
6       well including the FBI, the FBI terrorism teams,  
7       representatives of various terrorism teams. In Maryland --  
8       this is the State of Maryland, the Maryland State Police,  
9       Calvert County Sheriff's Department, porincy(phonetic)  
10      management services.

11               There was an open dialog between all parties, and  
12      that dialog continues. Our emergency plan was reevaluated  
13      every six months. We had meetings where we sat down and  
14      discussed if there were any problems. And if there were  
15      problems, those problems were taken care of, they were  
16      mitigated.

17               The Cove Point facility works in very, very close  
18      partnership with the Sierra Club and Maryland Heritage  
19      Trust. I would like for some of our folks who would like to  
20      learn more about those relationships to contact with these  
21      people in Calvert County. Calvert County, Maryland. Very,  
22      very -- like I said, very close working relationship.

23               One of our biggest headaches, even though there  
24      is light pollution, our berth is lit up 24 hours a day, so  
25      located a mile and further offshore. One of our biggest

1 problems was ospreys. Ospreys building their nest on the  
2 berth. And we had occasions where our men going out  
3 handling lines had to contend with very, very upset ospreys,  
4 who didn't like them in the area of their nest. This can be  
5 accomplished in a very, very cooperative manner. Neither  
6 side has all the answers. We have to sit down, we have to  
7 cooperate. It's been done before, it's been done in other  
8 places. It can be done in Long Island Sound. I've nothing  
9 to gain whether Broadwater energy builds that platform in  
10 Long Island Sound or not. I am retired. I also understand  
11 the demands of our country, the demands for energy.

12 LNG is part of the energy puzzle; that's all it  
13 is. It's not the be all and end all. It's not the ultimate  
14 answer. Takes a coordinated effort on the part of all  
15 parties involved in order to put this together. As I said  
16 I've worked closely with the Coast Guard, and I commend  
17 those men that I worked with down at the Chesapeake Bay  
18 area. They do not take this lightly. It's done with very,  
19 very serious intent. And I know that the Coast Guard nor  
20 FERC will permit this facility to go into Long Island Sound  
21 if they see any reason for it not to go there. I have that  
22 confidence in Department of Homeland Security and FERC.  
23 Thank you very much.

24 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next speaker is  
25 Bruce Whichard.

1                   MR. WHICHARD: I would like to thank you all for  
2                   having this public hearing and let everybody get up and  
3                   speak. My name is Bruce Whichard, and I am a lifetime  
4                   resident of the New York Metropolitan Area. Like some of  
5                   the other men here, I am a United States Coast Guard  
6                   licensed engineer. I have worked with the Liquified Natural  
7                   Gas vessels for over 11 years. The transportation of LNG  
8                   has an excellent safety record and an excellent  
9                   environmental record.

10                  LNG can be handled and transported in a safe and  
11                  very secure manner. During my 11 years on LNG carriers, I  
12                  worked for a New York based company, Energy Transportation  
13                  Corporation. I also was employed by a Connecticut based  
14                  company, Pronab Ship Management (phonetic). The LNG  
15                  carriers I worked on loaded Liquified Natural Gas from  
16                  liquification plants in Indonesia and discharged Liquified  
17                  Natural Gas to re-gasification plants in Japan. In Japan,  
18                  the ships pulled into shoreside terminals and discharged the  
19                  LNG into the re-gasification plants. The LNG ships and the  
20                  re-gasification facilities all within one mile of  
21                  residential Japanese communities, and they have been for  
22                  decades.

23                  I have reviewed many of the documents on  
24                  Broadwater's website. It is my understanding that the  
25                  terminal consists of a ship like vessel, more in the deep

1       waters of the Long Island Sound. This receiving terminal  
2       would be staffed by workers, qualified workers around the  
3       clock, just like our ships are. This floating storage and  
4       re-gasification unit would be very similar to the re-  
5       gasification facilities that the LNG ships pulled into while  
6       we were in Japan. The only difference being that the  
7       Japanese facility was on land, and like I previously stated,  
8       were within one mile of residential communities. Broadwater  
9       is considering re-gasification plant on the other hand nine  
10      and a half miles away from any coastline. Natural gas is  
11      safe to transport and store provided that there are  
12      qualified people handling and transporting it. Do I  
13      consider the transportation of LNG safe? Yes, I do. When  
14      my father entered into retirement some years back, he wanted  
15      see what I actually did for a living. So, I invited my  
16      father on board in my LNG ship to take the trip. My father  
17      felt comfortable and safe, and remained on board that ship  
18      for over 30 days. He didn't want to get off when the trip  
19      was over. If I did not think that the transportation was  
20      safe, I would never have let my father or anyone else in my  
21      family ever step foot on an LNG ship. I do hope that the  
22      FERC will consider my comments on the safety and security of  
23      LNG transportation operations as it concerns its  
24      application. Thank you.

25                   MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. The next speaker

1 will be John Case.

2 MR. CASE: Good evening, my name is John Case,  
3 and I am also a Chief Engineer with Merchant Marine, U.S.  
4 Coast Guard licensed, of course. And I do not live here; I  
5 live in Florida. But what I do bring to this hearing is 34  
6 years as an engineer, just about all of that transporting  
7 hydrocarbons of some sort or the other. 23 years of that  
8 was LNG. I've heard a few things here and I am going to get  
9 off my prepared statement. I've heard a few things here  
10 that's kind of got me interested. This is the first time  
11 that this is been proposed like this with a floating re-  
12 gasification facility. But it's not new. It's all proven  
13 equipment that's been around many, many years.

14 You've heard other engineers and the captains and  
15 mates; we started something 20 some odd years ago that was a  
16 first, we started a very large transportation of LNG project  
17 and there was a lot of nay-sayers in those days. And the  
18 word time bomb was brought up. There was a book they  
19 published on LNG on the floating time bomb. Well, in those  
20 20 some odd years, 25 years now that LNG is being  
21 transported around the world, nobody has yet to be able to  
22 study a catastrophic failure because we haven't had one.  
23 And why is that? Because nobody wants to be the first.  
24 Because the LNG is such a touchy, it is almost right up  
25 there with nuclear; nobody wants to be the first.

1                   So that means that they have to keep their  
2           vessels, their crew, their equipment, regulatory bodies, all  
3           have to be in step to keep this safe. Now, I can't address  
4           the ugly thing. I do know that when I was there on the West  
5           Coast where they had the oilrigs off the coast to  
6           California, they were ugly, so they painted them all,  
7           prettied them up with some sort of decoration. I don't know  
8           if you could do that. But I am here just to talk about the  
9           safety issues. And LNG is really safe if handled properly.  
10          And thanks to responsible operating companies, regulatory  
11          bodies, Coast Guards, ABS. The intensity that you people  
12          got us through was sometimes aggravating, but it was  
13          definitely to our benefit because we delivered LNG without  
14          any incidents to speak of.

15                 Now, we all got to have energy and LNG is the way  
16          to go. And I just -- I am just here like I said to speak  
17          about the safety of it, and the environmental of it.  
18          Studies have been done on blevees (phonetic) and things like  
19          this, and it really covers a very small area. And these  
20          ships, we did studies on 38,000 ton tankers hitting our  
21          ships, collisions and various angles, and how much would  
22          spill, and how much you know, fire and temperatures would  
23          spread from, you know, 1800 meters that 2400 meters. And it  
24          was all acceptable.

25                 I have reviewed these plans for Broadwater quite

1       thoroughly. And it is good plan; it's a sound plan, and  
2       it's a plan that will work. It will be safe. And I think  
3       the people in Long Island and Long Island Sound, after they  
4       see it, will say that maybe that's not so bad after all.  
5       Thank you for your time.

6               MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next speaker will  
7       be Kiki Kennedy.

8               MS. KENNEDY: Hello, my name is Kiki Kennedy. I  
9       am a resident of Branford. Unfortunately, I can't go to the  
10       Hearing tomorrow night. I'm also on the Board of  
11       Connecticut Fund for the Environment, and I am a practicing  
12       physician in New Haven. Before -- and actually I'd like to  
13       thank the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for coming to  
14       Connecticut and arranging this. And also I want to state my  
15       deepest appreciation to the U.S. Coast Guard for keeping us  
16       safe and keeping Long Island secure -- the Long Island Sound  
17       secure.

18               Before I start my actual comments, I just want to  
19       clarify a couple of issues that previous speakers have  
20       brought up. First of all, natural gas is indeed a cleaner  
21       burning fossil fuel than coal or oil, but it is still a  
22       fossil fuel and it still has by products of carbon dioxide  
23       which are the chief constituents for climate change. And  
24       all the existing information available from Broadwater does  
25       indicate that their gas will go to New York State and that

1       there are no plans to currently to convert any coal or oil  
2       burning components to natural gas. So in effect, their  
3       product will be only adding to existing fossil fuel usage in  
4       this area.

5               Second of all, I wanted to just say that pervious  
6       merchant marines' comments about safety features and so on,  
7       we are not concerned about their level of training, their  
8       competence, the safety of the ships. It really have to do  
9       with the unique geographic and environmental aspects of Long  
10      Island Sound as well as the over 200,000 small craft vessels  
11      that have been registered in Connecticut and Suffolk Long  
12      Island that are being operated by boaters who can be  
13      exhausted, intoxicated and experience not monitoring their  
14      radio or inaccurately using their GPS. So that's it really  
15      what it's about it.

16             It's about where this is, not about their safety  
17      or their competence. That said, I want to underscore a fact  
18      that was mentioned by someone earlier tonight which is that  
19      one tenth of the United States population lives within 50  
20      miles of Long Island Sound. That fact along with the fact  
21      that there has never been an FSRU constructed in the United  
22      States before, certainly not in estuary already designated  
23      as an estuary of national significance, and certainly not in  
24      an estuary that as PAWSA clearly states is stressed, fragile  
25      and threatened. These two facts alone should preempt

1 Broadwater's proposal.

2           The potential engineering malfunctions and  
3 inevitable technical snafus are far outweighed by the  
4 economic environmental safety and security risks to Long  
5 Island Sound, and the millions of people who rely on this  
6 multi-use waterway for recreation, fisheries, and  
7 transportation. Because despite it's fragility Long Island  
8 Sound is quite vital.

9           Broadwater will not doubt only further harm this  
10 vitality whether by unintentional accidental or spillage due  
11 to the newness of this technology, or through human error  
12 either intentional like terrorism, or unintentional like an  
13 experienced exhaustion or intoxication.

14           The Broadwater FSRU will negatively impact Long  
15 Island Sound in many ways. For example, the great aesthetic  
16 experience of the Sound like transforming it from a restful  
17 place of respite, which for many people who can't afford to  
18 travel out to rest of the National Parks, it's their only  
19 experience of wilderness that they can afford to have. It  
20 will transform it into an Industrial Park.

21           And as a physician, I can give you my  
22 professional opinion that this health impact, although  
23 difficult to monetize, is quite real.

24           Furthermore, it will -- the Broadwater project  
25 will further devalue shoreline real estate and perhaps

1 millions of billions of dollars, it's too difficult for me  
2 to imagine, as well as endanger the tourist industry that is  
3 just now expanding and growing in Southeastern Connecticut.

4 Furthermore, it will damage the commercial  
5 fishing industry whether by the exclusionary zones or for  
6 this shore, by potentially damaging shell fish beds if there  
7 is an instant that impacts water quality. Presently the  
8 shell fishing industry in Long Island Sound brings \$12  
9 million to the region and in fact Long Island Sound is the  
10 number one producer of plants in the Northeast. And despite  
11 the die-off lobsters in 1998, the lobsters just hadn't --  
12 the oysters just had a very beneficial set recently and the  
13 oyster population is expected to come down. Furthermore in  
14 Long Island Sound is a critical factor in transportation in  
15 New England and provides great relief of truck congestion  
16 from our already overcrowded I-95.

17 If there is an incident that impacts barge or  
18 tanker traffic, for more than a few days, especially through  
19 the front door Long Island Sound, the economic impacts to  
20 our regional economy could be devastating. Moreover  
21 Broadwater -- the Broadwater is just one more slippery slip  
22 down the steep slope of industrialization, and it is the  
23 destruction of the public trust which as the Attorney  
24 General mentioned, the sea floor is in trust for all of us  
25 in New York and Connecticut States.

1                   And the closest analogy that I could really come  
2                   to in terms of the public trust factor is to think of Long  
3                   Island Sound as some kind of beautiful antique glass  
4                   conservatory.

5                   You can imagine they were built around the turn  
6                   of the 19th and into the 20th century in many botanical  
7                   gardens. It's incredibly fragile but it houses an  
8                   incredible bio-diversity of plants, and people in the  
9                   community come to enjoy themselves there. Some stages  
10                  weddings and other kinds of events there, and suddenly the  
11                  Government decides it is appropriate for something like a  
12                  crystal meth lab to take over a large corner of that  
13                  conservatory, thereby degrading it's beauty and in  
14                  preempting its purpose and thereby also posing a real hazard  
15                  to the structure and its contents.

16                  Moreover, this perhaps, crystal meth lab reaps  
17                  all the financial benefits while the fragile glass  
18                  conservatory and the community shoulder all of the risks.  
19                  If an event occurs, the crystal meth lab will lose money but  
20                  the conservatory and the community will lose far more. I  
21                  could go on parallels of crystal meths and natural gas given  
22                  America's addiction to energy and the corporate energy  
23                  industry's financial incentives to grow that addiction,  
24                  that's beyond the scope of this meeting.

25                  I do have other specific concerns and questions

1       that I will detail in my written comments and using the  
2       primary concerns that are brought to light by the PAWSA,  
3       including light pollution, as well as safety concerns from  
4       hurricanes and other facts like that radar might not work  
5       near and FSRU.

6               Other concerns in the PAWSA have to do with the  
7       bottleneck at the front door of Long island Sound, The Race.  
8       I wonder what would happen if the submarine that needs to be  
9       unexpectedly deployed for national security can't get out  
10      because there's been an incident that blocks that Race. In  
11      that case not just Long Island Sound but indeed all of our  
12      nations security could be in dire straights. In fact that  
13      bottleneck could be so severe that it might be more  
14      appropriate to naming that area the dire straight.

15             Another concern addressed by PAWSA with waterway  
16      congestion, another concern addressed by PWASA is that with  
17      waterway congestion worsening, how can we even consider  
18      increasing the risks? Already 18 out of 24 measures were  
19      already at midlevel or even maxed out at 9 on some of these  
20      levels.

21             Furthermore, please consider that these risks are  
22      very real. What would happen if something like what had  
23      happened to City of Halifax in 1917 occurred? Back then, an  
24      underwater explosion put one third of Halifax under water.  
25      Long Island Sound is like a bathtub --

1                   You've seen what happened with Hurricane Katrina  
2                   in New Orleans. We don't have levees; I am very concerned  
3                   about what that -- how that -- what might happen there and I  
4                   encourage both the FERC and U.S. Coast Guard to do some real  
5                   technical modeling for a potential underwater or abovewater  
6                   explosion.

7                   Another concern is has the U.S. Coast Guard ever  
8                   successfully contained and surrounded a Liquefied Natural  
9                   Gas tanker? And if not, then can you truly protect us, the  
10                  people, our economic interests, and the Sound's living  
11                  organisms in the event that there is an LNG incident whether  
12                  intentionally or not.

13                  I would like to conclude with just a few  
14                  questions for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.  
15                  Specific points include number one, Broadwater is advocating  
16                  I understand a hot tap into the Iroquois Pipeline, yet in  
17                  many discussions with Connecticut DEP, the Islander East  
18                  Pipeline recommended against that. We would like to know  
19                  the truth. Is a hot tap safe or not? It can't be that its  
20                  okay in one proposal but not okay in another. You can't  
21                  have it both ways.

22                  Number two, in light of this, we would like to  
23                  have there be a re-evaluation of the need for Islander East  
24                  as well as for the cumulative environmental effects of  
25                  Islander East and Broadwater together. It seems that

1       Broadwater would tie into Iroquois and be able to transport  
2       huge volumes of natural gas that way. Therefore there seems  
3       to be existing unused capacity that right now is not being  
4       used to get natural gas to Long Island. Why do we need  
5       Islander East if there's unused capacity on Iroquois?  
6       Again, like my previous question, you can't have it both  
7       ways, either there is capacity and you can put gas to Long  
8       Island that way, or there isn't.

9               Lastly, I know that FERC's philosophy is to allow  
10       the industry to come to you for projects, but I implore you  
11       to reconsider this. The energy industry is very much  
12       motivated by investors' profits, not what is best for the  
13       consumer, the community or the environment. It's pitting  
14       community against community, and the community against the  
15       industry.

16               We really request that you please consider  
17       investing in a creation of a regional energy plan with  
18       things like request for proposals that puts a premium on  
19       minimizing on infrastructure that's unnecessary and also  
20       protects our environment.

21               In closing I want to thank you for listening to  
22       me and I do ask for to deny the certificate for Broadwater,  
23       and I do ask the U.S. Coast Guard to do all they can, even  
24       though I know they are in control to make sure that their  
25       certificate is denied. And I'd like to say that I have full

1 trust in Captain Boynton and I would love to see him  
2 nominated to head FEMA, if that opportunity arises. So,  
3 thank you very much.

4 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next speaker, Ms.  
5 Baeda Napolitino (phonetic).

6 MS. NAPOLITINO: Good evening. My name is Baeda  
7 Napolitino, and I'm here representing Connecticut Fund for  
8 the Environment. We're working in conjunction with Save the  
9 Sound, and I'll be just brief; I know you've heard quite a  
10 bit tonight. We'll be submitting a more detailed and  
11 comprehensive report in the future. But tonight I wanted to  
12 provide just a quick overview of our concerns on the  
13 Broadwater project that's proposed for Long Island Sound.

14 We're very concerned obviously about the possible  
15 construction of this project, the impacts that it will have  
16 on Long Island Sound, and the deeper implications that will  
17 arise if it is approved. One of our greatest concerns is  
18 obviously that the approval on construction of the project  
19 was the a precedent that will open Long Island Sound to  
20 further industrialization. We want to again be clear that  
21 this is furthering our reliance on fossil fuels, which, in  
22 the long term we do not believe is the wisest policy.

23 The environmental damage that this project would  
24 pose to the Sound is far too great. The construction of the  
25 pipeline anchors and their impact on water quality due to

1 the facility's operations are just two examples.

2 We want to underscore that it is our first  
3 responsibility to continue to preserve and protect Long  
4 Island Sound, and that's the real issue here. It is our  
5 natural resource; it holds tremendous meaning and value as  
6 referred to Connecticut residents, and billions of dollars  
7 have already been invested for this purpose. We don't feel  
8 that it's a good move to be on the opposite direction. We  
9 acknowledge that this is an important attempt to address the  
10 state's energy demands. However, we have unanswered  
11 questions about the actual direct benefits that this project  
12 would bring to the Sound, particularly as residents in  
13 regard to energy and economy.

14 Broadwater, as it has been mentioned, has not  
15 been able to give indication that there will be a direct  
16 supply of significance going to Connecticut. And with the  
17 economic value of the Sound estimated to exceed \$5 billion  
18 annually, the concern is clearly outweighing the benefits.

19 Meanwhile Connecticut's shoreline communities and  
20 economy will be impacted by the increased traffic, the  
21 interference with the boating and fishing community,  
22 security concerns, we've all heard. So given the multitude  
23 of these concerns that are associated with this project, we  
24 feel that it should not be approved and more evaluation and  
25 discussion of all the available options is necessary to

1 choose the best course of action for the state to meet its  
2 growing energy demands. The shoreline residents have been  
3 agreeing with us. Currently you may have heard that 30  
4 towns and cities in Connecticut have formally opposed the  
5 project, whether it be in the form of a resolution or by  
6 joining a coalition that we have, and we are continuing to  
7 do so because of their concerns. And as we heard, more and  
8 more officials are speaking out against the project as well.  
9 So with all these voices against the Broadwater project, we  
10 feel that we really need to reconsider our options. Thank  
11 you very much.

12 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next speaker will  
13 be Pauline Lord.

14 MS. LORD: Good evening. Thank you so much. I'm  
15 Pauline Lord, I'm from East Lyme. Hey. Thanks for  
16 conducting this hearing. My congratulations to Broadwater  
17 for turning out so many supporters from so far away. Very  
18 invigorating. I regret to say I'm not the least reassured  
19 by their many reassurances. I can't think of one good  
20 reason to endorse this project, really.

21 One thing that has not been brought up tonight  
22 but I think should be mentioned in the EIS is the  
23 environmental impact to the sites of extraction of the  
24 natural gas. I went on the web today, the LNG Watch  
25 Organization, and they report -- they seem to be well

1 researched -- that in Russia, on Sakhalin Island, Shell and  
2 ExxonMobil are extracting oil and gas in a pristine marine  
3 environment that is home to the critically endangered  
4 Western Pacific Grey Whale.

5 The Sakhalin Project has been mired in problems  
6 they say, including massive fish die-offs, two significant  
7 oil spills and contamination of the local water supply.

8 In the Canosia, the gas fields in Peru, a gas  
9 projects opening up one of the most pristine rain forest  
10 valleys in the Amazon threatening the livelihoods of  
11 riverine indigenous communities and the physical survival of  
12 isolated indigenous populations.

13 So it's not just our backyard or our frontyard,  
14 this is a global issue and a great concern. Many people  
15 talk about what happens if something catastrophic occurs  
16 that involves this LNG terminal. What happens if nothing  
17 catastrophic occurs? What happens if it's actually used  
18 correctly, if there's no Exxon Valdez type accident, there's  
19 no 9/11 type terrorist attack, there's no Category 5  
20 hurricane. Even when used correctly, this additional source  
21 of fossil fuels in our area is hazardous to our health.

22 We already suffer from the consequences of  
23 burning too many fossil fuels where everybody referring to  
24 '95 being so congested. I will say that the only tiny bit  
25 of good news that I have been able to glean coming out of

1 Hurricane Katrina is this; the spike in gas prices has  
2 actually caused people to reconsider their habits, their  
3 driving habits. They're suddenly taking the train or  
4 they're trying to start car pools. They're doing something  
5 to avoid going bankrupt by buying gas for their cars, and  
6 it's a wonderful thing to have a gas shortage sometimes.

7 This is not a country that's really worked hard  
8 to conserve in any way. We have the Texas Oilers in charge  
9 right now of the country. And I think it would be fine if  
10 we didn't have such an abundant source. People were saying  
11 there's a demand. Indeed there's a demand for a lot of  
12 things. It's not always good to meet the demand. Thank  
13 you.

14 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next speaker will  
15 be Michael Greave (phonetic).

16 MR. GREAVE: Thank you. My name is Michael  
17 Greave, I'm a lifelong resident of Southeastern Connecticut.  
18 I would mention the USS Cole, the World Trade Center,  
19 Oklahoma City, as just some examples as to why we should  
20 oppose this project. As a former military police officer  
21 trained with guarding nuclear missiles in Semitami (phonetic)  
22 headquarters in Europe, we got our number one rule was there  
23 was nothing a highly trained, highly motivated group of  
24 terrorists could not accomplish.

25 As mentioned before, Washington Harbor's work in

1 progress which is called SSI, involves extreme levels of  
2 security. There are no entry vessels as they enter the  
3 harbor. Closing the harbor, closing all the local bridges,  
4 stopping most vehicular traffic and vessel traffic on the  
5 waterways, the armed perimeter which is massive, it's not  
6 just three or four boats, it's a huge armed bubble that  
7 floats around this vessel as it's entering the harbor has  
8 orders to shoot to kill anybody encroaching that entire  
9 area. I consider that an awful lot of 50-calibre rounds  
10 flying through a heavy populated area when, not if,  
11 necessary. In addition, it is the necessity of that level  
12 of security that has me concerned. It is your assessment of  
13 risks that we're talking about that speaks to this issue.  
14 To keep it short, you've been here all night, it included --  
15 having lived in this area my whole life under the threat of  
16 ground zero, I would really appreciate not having another  
17 desirable target in my neighborhood. This project may be  
18 safe, but can we really protect it from someone intent on  
19 doing us harm? In today's world, with respect to the former  
20 Coast Guard and Merchant Marines of which -- I am a former  
21 merchant marine -- that was then, this is now.

22 Furthermore, please don't ask me to put any faith  
23 in this current White House Administration when the choices  
24 between big business and my safety and welfare. Thank you.

25 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Next is Peter

1 Dixon.

2 MR. DIXON: My name's Peter Dixon, I live in Old  
3 Lyme, I'm the third position to speak to you tonight. I'll  
4 keep my comments brief, it's late. Anybody that refers to  
5 Long Island Sound and talks about 1995 in the same breath  
6 doesn't know Long Island Sound. Long Island Sound is a  
7 phenomenal estuary that so far has pretty much survived a  
8 lot of industrial development.

9 Having said that, during this energy vacuum,  
10 people have said how much energy we're growing by year by  
11 year and our needs et cetera, we do need more energy. The  
12 problem has been mostly about this proposal is it's a big  
13 energy company coming in and saying, "Hey, here's a vacuum,  
14 we're going to solve this problem, this is our way of doing  
15 it." It's not the region that says, "Hey, we have an energy  
16 problem, we need more fuel, we need more electricity."

17 And I think Kiki's comment -- excuse me, I don't  
18 really know the last name -- is very well taken that -- what  
19 we need is a regional plan. When we have a Board or a  
20 Committee or that sort of thing, then that group is  
21 receptive to energy companies than anybody else coming up  
22 and saying, "This is what we'd like to do." I think then we  
23 can have a solution that serves the community, and I think  
24 to have one big company come in and say, "This is what we  
25 want to do," and have you guys do all that incredible safety

1 studies, which I am delighted that have been done but not  
2 have -- not been looking at the big picture and say, "Will  
3 this really solve the problem or is it just one company, you  
4 know, expanding its territory," that's a problem.

5 And I think as you look at this single proposal  
6 and evaluate in all the great ways that you're doing, which  
7 community residents like me are very grateful, if you look  
8 at it from the big picture and say is this really that  
9 solution that solves the -- New England's problem in  
10 consuming even more electricity. Let's look at the big  
11 picture and then solve some of the small things. Thank you.

12 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. And the final  
13 speaker on the list is Ed Root (phonetic).

14 MR. ROOT: Good evening, I'm Ed Root, I live in  
15 Old Savior, I have since 1948. I live about 200 feet from  
16 the Connecticut River. Sometimes art imitates life and  
17 sometimes life imitates art. A few years ago, a movie was  
18 made, and I'm not sure the name of it, but it was before  
19 9/11 in which hijackers commandeered a plane, changed the  
20 transponder and set it into a target at LNG facility off the  
21 Potomac River.

22 Now, luckily, the navy or the air force was able  
23 to figure out which hijacked plane and which was the good  
24 plane, and to determine which transponder was correct and  
25 they shot it down just before it hit it. But the prospect

1 of that happening could be very real if we have something  
2 that large anchored in the Sound because implanted in  
3 somebody's head somewhere in this world and we are targets.  
4 And if something like that should go off, it would probably  
5 devastate Bridgeport. It's a flat 10 miles, nothing to stop  
6 the fireball or a shockwave, and it would probably level the  
7 waterfront of Bridgeport as well as create huge waves.

8               Years ago, Long Island had the potential to solve  
9 their energy problem by putting up a nuclear plant at  
10 Shoreham but they decided they did not want the risk. So by  
11 the same token to have the risk, which we're not going to  
12 have any benefit more than likely off our territory as well  
13 as destroying a view that has been financed to an extent by  
14 millions of dollars of people who have bought LIS, Long  
15 Island Sound's license plates, seems to me a cruel joke.  
16 Thank you.

17               MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Well, I thank you,  
18 thank you very much to the speakers. We do have some more  
19 time and we can take additional speakers. Please, if you  
20 would like to speak go ahead and come on up one at a time  
21 and state your name at the podium, please.

22               MS. REEMSNYDER: Thank you. My name is Bonnie  
23 Reemsnyder. I am a selectwoman from Old Lyme. I attended  
24 this tonight because last night we had a selectman's  
25 meeting, and we did have a visitor who came to give us some

1 information about the Broadwater project. We had received  
2 previous information from Broadwater itself. This woman was  
3 a mom concerned about what was on the horizon. I also have  
4 some concerns about this. One major concern is that I don't  
5 really believe enough people know about this and that it is  
6 on our horizon. I applaud the people that are here tonight,  
7 but I think it's a small group if compared to what we would  
8 have if more and more people knew about it.

9 This woman last night told us about what some  
10 other towns are doing about this proposition, and I'm  
11 encouraged by their actions. Another concern I have is I'd  
12 like us all to picture ourselves 30 years down the road.  
13 For example, in our town, 30 years ago, a little bus depot  
14 was approved in a small area of town, a little side street,  
15 10 gasoline driven buses were allowed to park there. Today,  
16 that same bus depot houses 23 diesel-driven buses, there are  
17 five houses within 500 feet of those buses, and they are now  
18 finding out the dangers of diesel emissions.

19 There are children there, there are elderly  
20 people there and they are fighting very hard to have some  
21 recognition of the health issues that they are facing  
22 because of these buses. We have to live with that, and each  
23 year we're increasing the number that park there, and my  
24 question is when is enough, enough, and I'm not getting an  
25 answer on that, and I think they're just going to keep on

1 parking in there.

2 I'm concerned about the chemicals that we're  
3 finding in our waters, that we're now finding in our blood  
4 systems. I just don't think that we have the answers to why  
5 the lobsters have died down. All of this is such a fragile  
6 ecosystem. I think our efforts need to be focused on  
7 conservation. I too agree with the woman who said the one  
8 good thing from hurricane Katrina is that people are now  
9 paying attention to putting gas in their vehicles and  
10 conserving.

11 I'm also concerned as a selectwoman on the impact  
12 on tourism. We reap dollars from tourism. If there are  
13 damages to our waters in the town of Old Lyme, who will pay  
14 for those damages? As a selectwoman, I am concerned about  
15 our taxpayers' tax dollars.

16 With all of this in mind I want you to know I  
17 came here tonight to listen, to get more information, and so  
18 I'm glad that I waited till the end as an elected official  
19 to speak because I did listen well. And after hearing  
20 everything that was said, I will go back to our board of  
21 selectmen and I will propose a resolution be approved by our  
22 Board regarding opposition to the liquefied natural gas  
23 facility proposed by Broadwater Energy.

24 And I would like to take one more minute to read  
25 that resolution. Again, this is not approved by our town

1 but I will make this motion.

2 "Whereas Long Island Sound is one of the most  
3 beautiful and important bodies of water in the United  
4 States, home to thousands of species of wildlife and  
5 providing employment and recreational opportunities for  
6 millions of people throughout our region and represents a  
7 vital part of our nation's ecosystem, and whereas Broadwater  
8 Energy is proposing to construct a quarter mile long, 180-  
9 foot wide, nearly 10-story tall loading industrial complex  
10 approximately 10-and-a-half miles from the Connecticut  
11 shore, 17 miles from the Bridgeport-Port Jefferson-Long  
12 Island Sound ferry and nine miles from New York shore, and  
13 whereas this huge liquid natural gas re-gasification and  
14 storage facility proposed for the middle of a national  
15 treasure poses a significant threat to public health and  
16 ecological safety, and whereas a significant area of the  
17 Sound surrounding this platform will be designated a no  
18 boating, no fishing, no public access area, due to the many  
19 safety hazards in direct violation of the public trust Long  
20 Island Sound represents to the citizens of Connecticut and  
21 New York, and whereas this project also includes over 25  
22 miles of new undersea pipeline, a development that in and of  
23 itself will have a significant and potentially negative  
24 impact on the critically important sea bottom of the Sound,  
25 and whereas water quality in the immediate area will be

1 threatened by water intakes and discharges, sewage waste  
2 water treatment, storm water runoff and potential liquid  
3 natural gas spills, and whereas the visual and audible  
4 impacts of the massive lighted industrial facility will be  
5 significant, and whereas regional leaders have identified a  
6 variety of sustainable and reasonable energy alternatives  
7 including renewables, conservation and efficiency programs  
8 and approved LNG systems in citing that would meet our  
9 energy needs and create greater energy security benefits,  
10 and whereas these alternatives would not threaten Long  
11 Island Sound and its irreplaceable resources, now therefore  
12 be it resolved that our town wishes to go on record as being  
13 strongly opposed to the industrial complex proposed by  
14 Broadwater Energy or any such industrial complex of this  
15 magnitude for Long Island Sound."

16 I will make that proposal to our Board and  
17 hopefully it will pass it. I'd like to paint just one more  
18 picture that keeps coming to my mind when I'm thinking about  
19 this large structure in the middle of Long Island Sound.

20 Many years ago, as a young woman I was traveling  
21 with my now father-in-law on his small boat in the waters of  
22 Long Island Sound, and we were in a fog, it was before we  
23 had GSB and all of that, and we were listening to foghorns  
24 to make our way when we suddenly came upon a fleet of  
25 fishing boats, just a bunch of boats that were fishing

1       together. I can't imagine being in a fog and coming upon  
2       more tankers coming through in this floating facility. It  
3       would be very frightening in a fog to come upon that, so I  
4       am opposed to this also. Thank you for your time.

5               MS. REEMSNYDER: It's R-E-E-M-S-N-Y-D-E-R. Thank  
6       you.

7               MODERATOR MARTIN: Yes, please.

8               MS. LARDER: Thank you very much for allowing me  
9       to speak when I didn't sign up. Well, my name is Sheryl  
10      Larder. I'm from the town of Waterford; I too am on the  
11      Board of Selectmen for the town of the Waterford, and I came  
12      today to listen. I did not intend to speak. My Board was  
13      presented with a resolution to endorse an opposition to the  
14      Broadwater Energy project.

15              I was not provided with any information on the  
16      Broadwater Energy project as a member of the Board of  
17      Selectmen, other than a resolution in opposition to the  
18      project. I usually like to consider myself well informed, I  
19      do try to keep up on things and I did have to exert a -- I  
20      don't want to say significant, you can go on the web and do  
21      Broadwater Energy and find out information. But I did have  
22      to spend a significant amount of time reading about it,  
23      understanding the project, and understanding that you were  
24      going to be here today and talk about it.

25              So I don't want to take a position for or against

1       it, I've taken enough suggestions from people which way I  
2       should think; I've lived my whole life on the shoreline in  
3       Rhode Island, now in Connecticut. I guess what I would ask  
4       is, you have a task before you; whatever you choose to do, I  
5       still would suggest that there's not enough people in the  
6       area that know enough about this. Whatever your decision  
7       is, I'm still an advocate for people knowing what's coming  
8       down the pike, whether your decision is no, it's no and why.

9               If it's yes and why, I appreciate you being here,  
10       I've learned a lot here from people who have spoken on both  
11       sides, but I would encourage more information out to the  
12       public about this from whomever. Thank you.

13               MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Yes, sir.

14               REINHART: Thank you again for being here and  
15       having this forum. I want to agree with -- I'm sorry, I'm  
16       James Reinhart(phonetic). I'd like to agree again with the  
17       speaker just before me. There's just not enough information  
18       about what's going on out there, which is a problem. And,  
19       you know, I came here to garner some information and it's  
20       tough to listen to dubious data and statistics that probably  
21       don't hold a lot of weight.

22               And, you know, I was hoping that maybe your  
23       introductions might give us more information as well, and  
24       I'd been on the Internet also and the Broadwater site isn't  
25       clear either. There's a lot more information that needs to

1 be handed down to the public. And I wonder why I'm here,  
2 you know, it's really late at night and I've got an hour an  
3 half drive to get home, I'm from the other end of the Sound,  
4 I'm a Connecticut resident as well and, you know, I got a --  
5 I guess I have to ask myself why do I care about this?

6 Well, you know, I've grown up here and I probably  
7 I'm assuming that Connecticut is where I'm going to make my  
8 future. And I guess people have brought this up before that  
9 10 years ago there was a lobster die off and I was actually  
10 walking along the beach today and I kind of -- was walking  
11 along Hamanasi Beach and it's this time of the year when the  
12 waters start getting anoxic and there's a -- the lobsters  
13 start dying and I walked along the beach and I saw the  
14 carcass of lobsters strewn across the beach.

15 And I thought, well, if -- now I look out and I  
16 see a huge mass of plants standing out there in the middle  
17 of Long Island Sound, what's this going to say to the  
18 citizens of Connecticut. You know, how -- all the millions  
19 of dollars that have been spent in trying to create a better  
20 system for humans to live in and for the animals to try and  
21 make a comeback in, what's it for? And why should I make a  
22 difference anymore.

23 And some people are given statistics about \$20  
24 million lobster industry, oysters, and that stuff's all  
25 important to me. I don't know, but like I said before, I

1       just need to know more stuff because I've been hearing  
2       things left and right, I've been hearing about the Iroquois  
3       pipeline, to connect it apparently have to go through  
4       bedrock? Is this true? Which would mean dynamiting,  
5       exploding bedrock, I don't know. Is this true?

6               MODERATOR MARTIN: We haven't heard that before.

7               REINHART: Okay, so again, you guys aren't even  
8       aware of this stuff and -- but the public wants to know  
9       about it. Thank you.

10              MODERATOR MARTIN: Now let me just take a second  
11       because the previous two speakers commented on the lack of  
12       information. We don't have a full application for the  
13       project yet; we expect it at the end of November, sometime  
14       around that. Right now we have a number of reports that are  
15       parts of what the application will ultimately be in a draft  
16       form. Those reports are available on our website, the  
17       eLibrary link from [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov).

18              Everything that we say and do on the project ends  
19       up in that record, and everything the Broadwater sends to us  
20       ends up in that record and every comment made, the  
21       transcripts from tonight's meeting are also there. Now  
22       there's a lot of letters in there. A few thousand in  
23       opposition at this point, so it is sometimes a little  
24       cumbersome navigating through that massive information, but  
25       there's also some very good points in those letters and you

1       might want to take some time and read some of those as well.

2       Yes, sir.

3                   MR. SHEEHAN: My name is John W. Bill Sheehan  
4       (phonetic). I'm a resident of Waterford, Connecticut. I'm  
5       a retired navy nuclear submariner, so I have some  
6       understanding of the engineering concepts even though I did  
7       nuclear power. I really didn't know too much about the LNG  
8       project, and when I heard this hearing was going to come I  
9       decided to come. I hadn't decided to talk, but after  
10      listening to the speakers I decided I'll come up and say a  
11      little bit.

12                   I think while I may agree with the two previous  
13      speakers that not enough information has been made out to  
14      the general public so that -- otherwise I think this place  
15      would be jam-packed and we would have a speaker list that  
16      would go on into the night as occurred during some of the  
17      millstone recovery hearings.

18                   One of the biggest things of course is change.  
19      And having been out on the ocean I know that what we think  
20      of is going to be a large Queen Mary size edifice in the  
21      middle of Long Island Sound will be highly visible from the  
22      shore. And I know that although it interrupts some of the  
23      landscape, it probably won't be. But it certainly will  
24      interrupt the sea length.

25                   And I am sure that's part of the Coast Guards'

1       efforts to see what that interruption is, to build that  
2       large project down the middle of the Sound with a large  
3       security zone around it. It certainly is going to interfere  
4       with commerce and the number of ships that Captain Boynton  
5       talked about coming through the Sound. The timing of the  
6       transits of the LNG freighters with the transits of the  
7       submarines through the Race made me think of the fact that  
8       time when I was the officer of the deck of a submarine going  
9       into Tokyo Bay, and had to increase speed to prevent being  
10      overrun by the Tokyo Maru in the 60s.

11               And that's the type of the things that people are  
12      concerned about. In my business we used to say -- in fact  
13      you probably see the signs and I will use the censored  
14      portion -- bleep happens, and unfortunately one bleep will  
15      wipe out a million adaboys (phonetic) and so no matter how  
16      many, and how well trained -- and the folks that I worked  
17      with are well trained and I am sure that the LNG folks are  
18      very well trained, highly qualified, but bleep happens, and  
19      one bleep will wipe out a million adaboys and that's what  
20      everybody is afraid of.

21               They are afraid of that bleep. And especially  
22      what happened in the light of hurricane Katrina, and  
23      thinking of that losing -- breaking its moorings and come  
24      crashing down on something on the Sound either on the  
25      Connecticut side or the Long, Long Island side depending on

1 the direction of the winds and -- or a northeastern.

2 And we do get heavy weather here in the winter  
3 and the Sound is not a very friendly place in the middle of  
4 the winter and the northeastern. Stuff like that. I  
5 haven't seen the answers to those questions and until I know  
6 the answers of those questions and be satisfied, I really  
7 can't say that I would support this project. To say nothing  
8 -- this because I am not sure that we have engineered it  
9 safely enough to get down to the low percentage points of  
10 that bleep. Thank you.

11 MODERATOR MARTIN: Spell your last name, please.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: That's S-H-E-E-H-A-N.

13 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Devenia -- yes,  
14 yes, sir.

15 MR. GATWAS: Bob Gatwas, East Lyme. I am against  
16 this project because we have enough targets in our backyard.  
17 We have Millstone, we have Pfizers (?), we have the Subways,  
18 EB, we don't need another target. I am a man of short  
19 words, thank you very much.

20 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you, sir.

21 MR. ANGLON: My name is Chris Anglon(phonetic), I  
22 am from Cross Sound Ferry, Connecticut. And main reason I  
23 want to speak, Coast Guard are very familiar with our  
24 operation, but the members from the -- I just want to give  
25 you some information about what we do. Cross Sound Ferry

1 operates nine ferries; two of them are high-speed ferries.  
2 We carry approximately 1.5 million people between New  
3 Island, Connecticut and Orient Point, Long Island.

4 And approximately 500 vehicles vehicles aboard  
5 the ferries, and our route would take us across the intended  
6 route of the tankers. And our concerns are primarily that  
7 interaction that we'll be having with the tankers. We  
8 estimate on a busy summer day we probably transit that route  
9 about 68 times a day. So we would more than likely interact  
10 with almost every ship that would come in.

11 I know that Coast Guard is looking closely at our  
12 -- the safety and security, and we are confident that the  
13 recommendations would be adequate. Our concerns are they  
14 may interfere with our commerce back and forth across  
15 Sounds, as well as through the race, we would also have to  
16 have to go out to block(?) island. So we are not  
17 necessarily for or against but we just want to make our  
18 operation known to you and any effects that this may have on  
19 our operation. Thank you.

20 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you, sir. Yes, ma'am.

21 MS. SOBER: Good evening, I am Lucy Sober, living  
22 in Niantic. This is a question: will the citizens affected  
23 in this area will we have the opportunity to vote on this,  
24 or who's going to make the final decision?

25 MODERATOR MARTIN: The decision will be made by

1 the commissioners of FERC ultimately. Now we have an open  
2 process that is will be open to all public comments  
3 throughout our review of the project.

4 MS. SOBER: Thank you.

5 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you, will there be any  
6 other speakers?

7 MR. LIN: Good evening, my name is Sinsi  
8 (phonetic) Lin. I -- my last name is Lin, L-I-N. I did --  
9 this night -- I am from -- in fact tonight I am here to  
10 represent the head and director of the Department of Marine  
11 Sciences at the University of Connecticut. We were informed  
12 that there is a public meeting tonight regarding this Gas  
13 facility in Long island Sound.

14 And because she -- the head, Ian Buckley  
15 (phonetic) who is busy tonight, and I am here on behalf of  
16 her. I've heard all these comments on the positive side and  
17 the negative sides of this project, and I am not here to say  
18 support or oppose to the project. However, I would like to  
19 bring to attention about the potential impact of this  
20 project on the ecosystem.

21 As we've heard to some previous speakers as well,  
22 tis project has a very great potential impact on the  
23 ecosystem for which we may know -- we don't. I am not sure  
24 if there has been any investigation by the people who are  
25 proposing this project that what kind of impact to the

1 system it will be. As mentioned by previous speakers, Long  
2 Island Sound is a very vital ecosystem and yet it also is  
3 very fragile, very vulnerable.

4 We know that throughout this last several  
5 decades, there has been tremendous amount of change  
6 environmental degradation in the Sound. The government, the  
7 state and the private sectors, environmental groups have  
8 spent tremendous amount of money and effort trying to  
9 restore Long Island Sound, try to mitigate the pollution, or  
10 beautification throughout the Sound.

11 So, fortunately, we see that through the effort  
12 we have been able to maintain the Eastern Long Island Sound  
13 in a relatively pristine condition. So we hope that  
14 industrial operation would not destroy or degrade this  
15 Eastern Long Island Sound. How to do that? I think we can  
16 only do this through very objective and scientific  
17 investigation on the potential impacts.

18 All the other imagined or predicted impacts  
19 cannot really present us with real confidence, how much  
20 impact it will cause. In addition to all those safety and  
21 security issues that are obvious, I would like to ask  
22 whether we know that such a enormous platform deployed in  
23 the middle of the Sound would change the circulation pattern  
24 of the sea of the Sound would change, the water chemistry of  
25 the Sound, would disturb the sediment, okay, the basic

1 environment of the Sound.

2 And as such would it aggravate the conditions  
3 that have been threatening organisms in the Sound such as  
4 Lobsters and other basic organisms. So I think it is very  
5 important that we have some sort of well thought out, well  
6 planned and fully implemented investigation on this  
7 potential impact on the ecosystem. What we tend to when --  
8 for the industrial development, I think we tend to put this  
9 ecological impacts on a lower priority.

10 However, the impact will be noted, we have to  
11 learn the lesson right now how much money we put in just to  
12 clean up the western part of the Long Island Sound. It's  
13 millions and millions of dollars and it involves wonderful  
14 states, wonderful agencies. And so I'd like to just bring  
15 this to your attention to consider. Thank you.

16 MODERATOR MARTIN: Thank you.

17 SPEAKER: One of our Board members did request:  
18 is there a possibility of having a presentation by both  
19 sides moderated, and my question is what is the time line.  
20 You said this is a pre-application; once the application  
21 comes in what is the process and the time line? How soon do  
22 you foresee a decision being made? And between the time the  
23 application actually comes in and the decision-making, what  
24 kind of presentations will be made to the public?

25 MODERATOR MARTIN: With regard to the

1 presentation on the project, I guess my recommendation at  
2 this point would be to invite Broadwater to bring that  
3 presentation. Our first product that will give our draft  
4 analysis of the project will be the draft environmental  
5 impact statement. Right now we are targeting something  
6 approximately four months after we get the application with  
7 the draft. The final, you know, would be determined  
8 somewhat by the amount of information that we have been able  
9 to gather in generating the draft.

10 So I can't give you the date right now for when  
11 the Commission would make a determination but I can give you  
12 that the draft is probably going to be somewhere around four  
13 months following the application assuming that the  
14 application is complete.

15 SPEAKER: What about --

16 MODERATOR MARTIN: Well, at that point we would  
17 come back and hold more public meetings, and people could  
18 comment directly on the draft. There is a 45-day comment  
19 period after the issuance of the draft, and we're listening  
20 right now and we'll be doing so throughout the process for  
21 the next several months.

22 SPEAKER: Will those organizations would have  
23 come together with closing information be invited to do  
24 presentations or something?

25 MODERATOR MARTIN: Well, we're not going to be

1       inviting people to give presentations. We'll just be  
2       providing, again, a comment form for people to comment on  
3       our draft environmental impact statement. It won't be a  
4       presentation by Broadwater or anyone else at that meeting.  
5       It would just be FERC and Coast Guard that will present at  
6       this meeting.

7               Are there any other speakers that would like to  
8       address FERC and Coast guard tonight? Okay, we thank you  
9       very much. You've been very courteous; we appreciate your  
10      comments and your patience. We'll be taking all this  
11      information back to Washington and we'll be considering it  
12      very carefully. Thank you.

13              (Whereupon, the proceedings of the meeting was  
14      adjourned.)

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24